

MAR 5 1931

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
L. WHIBLEY, M.A.  
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.  
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,  
representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary) representing the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLV

FEBRUARY, 1931

No. I

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	I	REVIEWS (continued):	
HITTITE NAMES. A. SHEWAN .. .. .	2	Xenophon, <i>Anabasis I.-III.</i> (Masqueray), E. C.	
THE DATE OF CORINNA. C. M. BOWRA .. .	4	MARCHANT .. .. .	21
ÆSCHYLUS, Septem 12-13. A. Y. CAMPBELL	5	<i>The Growth of Plato's Ideal Theory</i> (Frazer).	
TWO NOTES. J. D. DENNISTON .. .. .	7	J. L. STOCKS .. .. .	22
ΣΤΝΕΣΙΣ and ΣΤΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ. H. OSBORNE	8	<i>Theophrastus: Characters</i> (Edmonds), F. H.	
ΜΕΤΡΑ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗΣ. A. S. F. GOW	10	SANDBACH .. .. .	23
COMMISSA PIACULA (VERG. <i>Aen.</i> VI. 569)		<i>Herodes, Cercidas, etc.</i> (Knox). J. M. Edmonds	24
W. B. ANDERSON .. .. .	13	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas dialectos</i>	
ΠΡΟΒΑΤΟΓΝΩΜΩΝ. W. H. D. ROUSE .. .	14	<i>selectae</i> (Solmsen-Fraenkel). P. S. NOBLE	28
ON HERODOTUS I. 33. L. I. C. PEARSON ..	14	<i>Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de</i>	
REVIEWS:		<i>Virgile</i> (Herrmann); <i>Le Messianisme de Virgile</i>	
<i>Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks</i> (Burn). W. R.		(Jeanmaire); <i>Virgile et le Mystère de la IV<sup>e</sup></i>	
HALLIDAY .. .. .	14	<i>Épilogue</i> (Carcopino). R. S. CONWAY .. .	29
<i>A Survey of Ancient History</i> (Laistner). H. A.		<i>Repetita</i> (Heitland). J. G. C. ANDERSON .. .	33
ORMEROD .. .. .	15	<i>Aquileia Romana</i> (Calderini). M. CARY .. .	34
<i>Selected Essays of J. B. Bury.</i> A. W. GOMME	16	<i>Imperial Roman Spain: The Objects of Trade</i>	
<i>Greek and Roman Mythology</i> (Fox). H. J. ROSE	17	(West). M. P. CHARLESWORTH .. .. .	35
<i>The Technical Arts and Sciences of the Ancients</i>		<i>Plotinus Schriften übersetzt, I.</i> (Harder). E. R.	
(Neuburger). E. J. FORSDYKE .. .. .	19	DODDS .. .. .	35
<i>The Hundred Best Poems (Lyrical) in the Greek</i>		SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	36
<i>Language</i> (Macnaghten); <i>The Oxford Book of</i>		SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. .. .	46
<i>Greek Verse</i> (Murray, etc.). G. A. DAVIES	20	OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY .. .. .	47
		BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	47

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3  
Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW  
25s net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; inquiries to the Hon. Secretaries, Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury, c/o The Triangle Secretarial Offices, 61, South Molton St., London, W. 1; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Miss H. Lister, Manchester High School for Girls; Dr. G. A. Auden, 42, Lordswood Road, Harborne, Birmingham; Mr. G. B. A. Fletcher, The University, Liverpool; Professor F. S. Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. Pitman, The University, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss W. A. Greatbatch, 150, Park Road, W. 4; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Lake Road, West Cardiff; Mr. D. E. F. Binyon, The University, Leeds; Miss A. I. S. Smith, West Leeds High School for Girls, Armley, Leeds; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, Christ Church, Oxford; Mr. F. P. B. Shipham, 48, Rutland Gardens, Hove; Mrs. F. G. Maunsell, University College, Southampton; Professor F. Fletcher, 48, Polsloe Road, Exeter; Dr. G. H. Goldsmith, 6, Bromham Road, Bedford; Dr. M. M. Gillies, University College, Hull; Miss N. C. Jolliffe, The University, Reading; Mr. G. H. P. P. Tredennick, 28, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield; Mr. H. Hill, University College, Swansea; Mr. D. L. Hewitt, Wyggeston School for Boys, Leicester; Mr. R. Dobbin, 326, Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand; Dr. W. H. S. Jones, St. Catharine's College, Cambridge; Mr. A. M. Moore, Byam's, Fitzhead, Taunton.

## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,  
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo. 490-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.  
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

### READY NOW

#### Latin

- 239. *S. Augustine: Select Letters.* Translated by J. H. BAXTER.
- 240. *Cicero: Pro Quintio, Pro Roscio Amerino, Pro Roscio Comoedo, Contra Rullum.* Translated by J. H. FRESE.
- 246. *Bede: Stapleton's Translation.* Revised and
- 248. edited by J. E. KING. 2 vols.

#### Greek

- 235. *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists.* Translated by C. B. GULICK. 7 vols. Vol. IV.
- 242. *Josephus.* Translated by H. St. J. THACKERAY. 8 vols. Vol. IV.

#### Greek

- 237. *Plato: Republic.* Translated by PAUL SHOREY. 2 vols. Vol. I.
- 241. *Strabo: Geography.* Translated by H. L. JONES. 8 vols. Vol. VII.
- 243. *S. Basil: Letters.* Translated by ROY DEFERRARI. 4 vols. Vol. III.
- 238. *Demosthenes: Olynthiacs, Philippics, Leptines and minor public Orations (I-XVII and XX).* Translated by J. H. VINCE.
- 244. *Lysias.* Translated by W. R. M. LAMB, in one volume.
- 247. *Philo.* Translated by F. H. COLSON and the REV. G. H. WHITAKER. 10 vols. Vol. III.

*Machines or Mind?* (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library)

FREE together with Descriptive Prospectus, etc.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

and  
pon  
onal  
) to  
eate

nual  
5s.  
ings  
sical  
sical  
fore  
must

Iose,  
t. M.  
o the  
ster ;  
oad,  
F. S.  
Basil  
atch,  
Mr.  
Girls,  
Lees,  
B. L.  
F. G.  
eter ;  
lege,  
eech  
eston  
and ;  
head,

7

ce  
e,

L

ce

Y

ss

ce

B,

ce

I.





# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1931

## NOTES AND NEWS

FROM a correspondent:

The Classical Association held its Annual General Meeting at Bedford College, Regent's Park, London, from January 5 to 8. There was a large and representative attendance of members, and the meeting must be pronounced a decided success.

Proceedings opened with a reception at the College by the Principal, Miss G. Jebb, who with Miss Tarrant did everything possible to make the visitors feel themselves welcome.

A novel feature of the meeting which was much appreciated was an informal dinner of about fifty members at the Florence Restaurant. There were no speeches, and the object of social intercourse was achieved to the complete satisfaction of all present.

The great event of the meeting was the Presidential Address. Professor A. C. Clark is such an authority on the Italian Renaissance that his lecture on Petrarch and his part in paving the way for the revival of letters was expected to be, what in fact it was, masterly. Petrarch himself was sketched to perfection, but the most interesting passage of the lecture was the incidental reference to the earlier attempt of Grosse-teste to bring Greek learning to England, while it still survived in Calabria. Petrarch himself was unable to acquire the language from the more ignorant Greek-speaking Italians of a later age. Dr. Mackail, Professor Clark's contemporary at Balliol, proposed a vote of thanks, and, in seconding it, Professor Lascelles Abercrombie appealed to the Association to take mediaeval Latin into its purview. As Sir Frederic Kenyon pointed out next day in presiding at a lecture on the British Academy's work in preparation for a mediaeval Latin dictionary, much has already been done in this direction, both in Great Britain and in the United States. Mr. Charles Johnson, of the Record

Office, who is secretary of the committee which has already collected 90,000 slips for the period 1066 to 1600, described the work done since the war. The plan has been to collect words used in British sources from 800 to 1600; the material for the earlier period is to be placed at the disposal of an international committee, and a dictionary of British Latin is in preparation for the whole period. Pending its publication a short word-list will be issued for the help of students. That the undertaking had already progressed so far was a welcome surprise. Those who have leisure to help are asked to communicate with Professor J. H. Baxter of St. Andrews for the earlier period, and with Mr. Johnson at the Record Office for the later period.

The Association listened with the greatest delight to Dr. Macan's lecture on 'Pindar as Historian.' He was in his happiest vein, and it was a pleasure to hear his stimulating eloquence. The paper will be published in full in *Proceedings*, as will also be the paper of Mr. Cyril Bailey on Virgil's use of Lucretius. Both were felt to be real contributions to the subjects. Dr. Storr-Best, out of the fulness of his knowledge, delivered an admirable lecture on Varro, and those who heard it may consider themselves fortunate. Professor Granger covered a wide field in his paper on 'Latin in the Workshops,' and Mr. Casson lectured on Constantinople with his usual ability. But the most encouraging feature of the meeting was that, alongside of the performances of veteran scholars, there were two contributions from the younger generation of outstanding merit. Miss W. Lamb described her excavation of five successive strata of occupation at Thermi in the island of Lesbos, related them convincingly to the two earliest settlements of Troy, and foreshadowed the exploration of another

and greater prehistoric site. Mr. H. Hill, of University College, Swansea, contributed a masterly treatment of a historic problem, Sulla's enlargement of the Senate, and showed good reason for preferring the authority of Livy's epitomator and Appian to that of Sallust. Both papers showed that our younger scholars are producing as good work as their predecessors, and that the torch of British classical learning is being handed on without danger of extinction.

It only remains to be added that the perennial subject of set books in school

examinations was discussed with keenness, and that as usual unanimity was unattainable. Sir George Macdonald was elected President for the ensuing year, and the invitation of Reading University to hold the next meeting there was accepted. This will be in April, 1932.

The only note of sadness in the meeting was the loss of Dr. Norman Gardiner. Mr. R. M. Rattenbury, of Trinity College, Cambridge, was elected as Secretary in his place.

The proceedings, thanks to Miss Gedge, went without a single hitch.

### HITTITE NAMES.

THE names under reference are those on the Boghaz Keui tablets which exhibit a more or less close resemblance to names of personages known in early Greek history or tradition, and of places in Greece or Asia Minor. The importance of this for Greek prehistory, if identifications are proved, has been recognised in most of the recent works on that period.

In 1924 Sir Frederic Kenyon, speaking as President of the Hellenic Society, said on this point: 'The resemblances are too numerous to be attributed to chance, and there is nothing in the information to be derived from these tablets which is irreconcilable with our other knowledge,'<sup>1</sup> and the remark may be repeated with greater force to-day. Sir Frederic specified Achaia, Aeolus, Lesbos, Eteocles, Andreus, and Atreus, and to these may now be added names resembling Alexandros, Troia, Ilios, Motylos, *κολπavos*, and even Asia and Amorites. And Khathi itself; Gladstone long ago suggested that the *Κήττειος* of λ 521 were Hittites, and Kretschmer has come to the same conclusion.<sup>2</sup> Professor Garstang in his recent volume<sup>3</sup> gives, with due caution, a number of other place-names from the tablets, including such familiar ones as Chersonesos, Pedasos and Miletos.

In a short note I can give only in summary fashion the views of scholars as far as I have observed them. Among high authorities who seem to be entirely favourable to the identifications are Drerup,<sup>4</sup> Kretschmer,<sup>5</sup> Buck,<sup>6</sup> Glotz,<sup>7</sup> Hans Philipp,<sup>8</sup> Sturtevant,<sup>9</sup> and Riess.<sup>10</sup> For the views of Professor Myres I refer to pp. 115-17, 120, 165 (a note on the cumulative effect of the evidence), and 327 of his *Who were the Greeks?* In the *C.A.H.* his appears to be the only reference to the matter; he doubted, on p. 636 of Vol. III., the equation Attarissyas-Atreus, but in his new work he appears to accept it. Dr. Giles, in a paper read to the Cambridge Philological Society on January 31, 1924, announced Forrer's discoveries as regards Atreus and Achaeis, and appeared to be satisfied as to the latter. In a later statement he thinks it likely that the heroes of Greek legend 'are in a fair way to be restored to history.'<sup>11</sup>

<sup>4</sup> 'Neues über Mykenä und Homer,' in the *Phil. Woch.* for 1926, 229 ff.

<sup>5</sup> 'Der König Alaksandus von Vilusa,' in *Glotta* XIII. (1924) 205-13.

<sup>6</sup> 'The Language Situation in and about Greece in the Second Millennium B.C.,' in *C.P.* XXI. (1926) 1 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Histoire grecque*, 89 f. and 92.

<sup>8</sup> Reviewing in the *Phil. Woch.* for 1925, 188, three works on the Hittites, two of them by Forrer, and quoting a paper by Emil Vetter in the *Wiener Blätter* for 1924.

<sup>9</sup> *C.W.* XVIII. (1925) 175.

<sup>10</sup> *C.W.* XXIII. (1930) 21.

<sup>11</sup> *The Year's Work* for 1924-5, 122-5.

<sup>1</sup> *J.H.S.* XLIV., Proc. xxii. f.

<sup>2</sup> *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, Heft I. 7-14.

<sup>3</sup> *The Hittite Empire*, 179 ff.

In Harmsworth's *Universal History of the World*, Myres, Garstang, Wace, and Casson accept certain identifications.<sup>1</sup> Carl Schuchhardt also is satisfied: *die griechische Tradition ist also erstaunlich zuverlässig*.<sup>2</sup> Professor Garstang remarks the increasing light on obscure legends from these archives.<sup>3</sup> Nilsson, while allowing there may be room for doubt in some instances, has none as regards Achaia.<sup>4</sup> Rostovtzeff finds the discoveries very encouraging for the study of early Greek settlements in Asia Minor.<sup>5</sup> Burn<sup>6</sup> and Bowra<sup>7</sup> make brief references. Professor Sayce accepts the Achaeans and Lesbos, and Troy, but argues that the Attarissyas of the tablets is Perseus, not Atreus.<sup>8</sup> This is an identification on which several authorities hesitate; Autran is one who is not convinced.<sup>9</sup>

One of the latest references to these doublets is by the late Mr. H. R. Hall in Lecture VI. of *The Civilisation of Greece in the Bronze Age*, and it suggests a query. Certain of the identifications are awkward for a particular view, but Mr. Hall reflects, p. 249, that they 'rest on the personal opinion of one scholar of enthusiastic view,' and notes how 'the doctors disagree.' He is, however, impressed by the resemblances, and eventually, p. 290, 'suspends judgment.' Now in the early part of the same lecture he has discussed the 'Peoples of the Sea,' whose names to the number of a dozen or so as given in Egyptian records are paralleled by well-known Greek names. He seems to find no ground for rejecting the identifications; no scholar does reject them all, though there may be a doubt in one instance or another. In fact, Mr. Hall says on p. 242 that 'the cumulative evidence of

their names is cogent.' But if we are to accept all or nearly all the names from Egyptian sources, why should we reject those from the Hittite tablets? The two cases seem exactly similar.

To sum up, it may be said that, in the great majority of the references to Forrer's interpretations, no difficulty is felt. In direct opposition little has been said, so far as my observation goes. In 1925 Johannes Friedrich, in a paper in *Das humanistische Gymnasium*, examined Forrer's identifications, and came to the conclusion that some were correct, others possible, and one or two quite wrong. But two years later he disputed the literal correspondence of several of the names.<sup>10</sup> This is, so far as I know, the only reasoned attempt to invalidate Forrer's transliterations. There may, of course, be others. But objectors generally confine themselves to intimating a doubt as to one name or another.

In conclusion it may be noted that, while so many high authorities on Greek prehistory regard these discoveries as material of high value for their investigations, others go further, and find in them confirmation of the historicity of the Homeric record. In words I find quoted from Weber's *Staatenwelt des Mittelmeeres in der Frühzeit des Griechentums*, the *Mythos* of Homer has become *erlebte Gegenwart*.<sup>11</sup> But this is anathema to certain reconstructors of Iliads and Odysseys of their own. Wilamowitz, in the preface to his recent volume on the *Odyssey*, finds what has been written on the subject merely 'chaotic,' a series of 'bewildering assertions accompanied by helpless fumbling in mythological story.' A great contrast this to the respectful treatment accorded by many eminent scholars! Bethe again, in the preface to his last volume, *Homer III.*, declines to devote a word to Forrer's discoveries; even if it were proved that Ahhijava is Achaia, 'it would be of no significance for the saga of the Trojan War,' which sounds strange from one who has

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 737, 789, 868, 870, 1031.

<sup>2</sup> *Alteuropa*<sup>2</sup>, 227.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 172, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Das homerische Königtum*, 24, note.

<sup>5</sup> *A History of the Ancient World*, 177.

<sup>6</sup> *Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks*, 136 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, 169 and 179.

<sup>8</sup> *Antiquity* I. 204 ff., and *J.H.S.* XLV. (1925) 161 ff.

<sup>9</sup> *Introduction à l'Étude du Nom propre grec*, 512. On Atreus see letters to *The Times* of March 8 (Mr. Seltman), March 12 (Mr. Mott), and April 8 (Sir Arthur Evans), 1924.

<sup>10</sup> 'Werden in der hethitischen Keilschrift-texten die Griechen erwähnt?' in *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, Heft 1. Forrer replied in Heft 2.

<sup>11</sup> See *Phil. Woch.* 1926, 1115.

evolved the very peculiar theory that the connexion of the Greeks with the Troad dates only from 700 B.C. And, lastly, Rudolf Dahms, author of *Ilias und Achilleis*, in a review of Bethe's work, quotes the above words from the preface, and remarks that it is 'delightful to read this, in view of so much blühenden Phantasiegebildes'.<sup>1</sup> But the cogency of these identifications and their bearing on both Greek prehistory and Homeric origins have been so

generally recognised, that it is useless to reply with a contemptuous *ignoro, ignorabo*. The attitude of this school of Homerists will probably recall to some a historic scene at Towcester a century ago. 'He won't,' said Mr. Slurk; 'not that he's afraid. Oh no! He won't!'

A. SHEWAN.

St. Andrews.

P.S.—Kretschmer returns to Alak-sandus and Vilusa in *Glotta* XVIII. (1930).

<sup>1</sup> *Phil. Woch.* 1927, 1282.

### THE DATE OF CORINNA.

IN *Hermes* LXV. (1930), pp. 356-365, Mr. E. Lobel has put forward, with some uncertainty, a view that Corinna was not a contemporary of Pindar, but lived at some later period before 300 B.C. Coming from an authority so distinguished, and combined with much that is acute and just on questions of language and metre, this opinion is bound to receive serious consideration. But if we examine it closely, we shall see that the arguments on which it is founded are unpersuasive.

Mr. Lobel's first argument is that the view that Corinna was a contemporary of Pindar is based on the fragment where she takes Myrtis to task for trying to compete with him (Bergk *P.L.G.* III., fr. 21). This, we are told, is no evidence for date; nor need we regard it as corroborating the different stories of Pindar's relations with Corinna known from Plutarch, Aelian, Pausanias and Suidas. Mr. Lobel dismisses these pieces of evidence as 'contradictory and somewhat childish information.' It is of course true that the scholars of Alexandria and Byzantium liked to have stories which involved the juxtaposition of famous names, and that as they recorded quarrels between Pindar and Bacchylides, so they liked to think of Pindar being taught or censured or defeated by Corinna. The stories themselves may well be fabrications, but they would never have won any acceptance had the Alexandrian scholars not believed that Pindar and Corinna were contemporaries. Even the tritest

of literary anecdotes requires some basis of fact, and when Mr. Lobel denies the whole tradition outright, he strikes at the roots of ancient chronology and can only be justified if he provides really cogent evidence to prove his case.

This indeed he tries to do. He points out that Corinna, unlike most early poets, commonly fails to lengthen a vowel naturally short before the combination of a mute and a liquid. In this respect her practice is the opposite of that of Sappho and Alcaeus, and Mr. Lobel finds this 'would appear unquestionably to be a sign of relative lateness.' Here, then, is an important view requiring close consideration. The facts are undoubtedly as Mr. Lobel states them, but they do not prove his contention of a late date. In the first place, though Sappho and Alcaeus lengthen naturally short vowels before the combination of a mute and a liquid, not all early poets follow the same practice. Pindar freely leaves them short. In *Olympian* I. there are nine cases of it: I. 2 ἔξοχᾶ πλούτου, I. 17 θαυὰ τράπεζαν, I. 19 ὑπὸ γλυκυνάταις, I. 40 Ἀγλαδτρίαναν, I. 60 μετὰ τριῶν, *ib.* ὅτ' κλέφαις, I. 66 τὸ ταχύπῳτμον, I. 89 ἀνεφρόντισεν, I. 106 ἐπίτροπος, and this frequency of shorts is maintained throughout his work. Bacchylides provides: I. 4 αἰολῳπρύμοις, III. 65 πλείονᾶ χρυσόν, *ib.* 83 δσιᾶ δρών, IV. 2 ὁ χρυσόκομας, V. 107 ἐνθά πλημύρων, *ib.* 153 πύματον δὲ πνέων, XII. 45 θνατοῖσι κραιῶν, *ib.* 74 πᾶτρώαν, *ib.* 191 μελέταν τέ βροτωφέλεᾶ, XIV. 44 διέδρα-



μεν, XVI. 1 κυανοπρωρα, *ib.* 39 πολέ-  
μαρχῆ Κυωσίων, *ib.* 108 ὄγροισι ποσσίν,  
*ib.* 111 Ἀμφίτρεταν, XVIII. 16 φεύγῃ  
χρυσέα. The papyrus of Ibycus' poem  
to Polycrates (*Ox. Pap.* 1790) gives:  
l. 21 ἀρχῇ Πλεισθενίδας, l. 47 Πολύ-  
κρατες; and Timocreon's poem to  
Themistocles gives three cases in twelve  
lines: l. 7 ἐς πατρίδ' Ἰάλυσον, l. 10  
ὑπὸ πλεως, l. 11 ψυχρὰ κρέα. Nor is  
the usage entirely absent from the  
Lesbian poets, on whom Mr. Lobel  
bases his case. In the normal poems  
of Sappho we find ὀπλοισι (*a* 5, 19),  
and in the abnormal *μαλδρόπης*  
(*η* 2 a 2). The *Wedding of Hector and*  
*Andromache* cannot be pressed as evi-  
dence, as its authorship and date are  
alike uncertain, but it provides l. 8  
ἐλίγματ' χρύσια and l. 14 ὄχλος.  
Having drawn his rules to exclude these  
cases, Mr. Lobel thinks that ὀπλοισι  
must be corrupt, and that *μαλδρόπης*  
being 'abnormal' needs no further con-  
sideration. It is equally easy to believe  
that Sappho sometimes, though not  
commonly, varied her usual practice,  
and allowed a vowel naturally short to  
remain so before a mute and a liquid.  
The general conclusion to be drawn  
from this evidence is that the practice  
of Corinna does not differ substantially  
from that of Pindar, Bacchylides, Iby-  
cus, and Timocreon. She does indeed  
employ this usage more than they do,  
but she agrees with them in employing  
it in addition to lengthening a short  
vowel before a mute and a liquid. Her  
freedom in this is markedly different  
from the strict rules of Alcman and  
Alcaeus, and, to a lesser degree, from  
those of Sappho. But if we accept the  
traditional date for Corinna, this is just  
the result we should expect. Her prac-  
tice is that of her contemporaries, not

that of poets who are on any calculation  
two generations earlier.

A second serious objection may be  
levelled against Mr. Lobel's theory.  
He says that there is not 'any reason  
based on internal evidence why we  
should not suppose that she lived at a  
time when the form in which her poems  
were made public corresponded exactly  
. . . to the form in which the Berlin  
papyrus preserves them.' This means  
that there was no *μεταγραμματισμός*  
and that the poems as we have them,  
written in the Boeotian spelling used  
from 350 to 250 B.C., are substantially  
as they were written by Corinna. This  
point however is delusive. The poems  
as we have them cannot have been  
written just like this, for the simple  
reason that the existing spelling causes  
metrical anomalies which are removed  
if we substitute a more normal form.  
The papyrus gives us l. 20 κρονφίαν, l. 11  
δουίν, 59 κρονφάδαν, 69 ἀδούτων?, 74  
Ούριεύς, in accordance with the revised  
Boeotian spelling. But these forms are  
all unmetrical, and the metre can only  
be restored if we read κρυφίαν, δουείν  
or δυοίν, κρυφάδαν, ἀδύτων, Τριεύς. The  
conclusion can only be that Corinna  
wrote a language more akin to the  
standardised language of Greek poetry  
than the spelling of the papyrus  
would at first lead us to think. She  
wrote before the new spelling was intro-  
duced; it distorted her quantities and  
no argument can be drawn from it to  
fix her date after its introduction.

The conclusion must be that Mr.  
Lobel's case breaks down on these two  
points, and that, if he wishes to discredit  
an ancient tradition supported by quite  
reputable classical authority, he must  
find other and more cogent evidence.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

#### AESCHYLUS, *SEPTEM* 12-13.

- ὑμᾶς δὲ χρὴ νῦν, καὶ τὸν ἑλλείποντ' ἐτι  
ἤβης ἀκαμαίς, καὶ τὸν ἐξήβον χρόνῳ  
12 βλαστημὸν ἀλδαίνοντα σώματος πολλόν,  
13 ὥραν τ' ἔχοντ' ἕκαστον ὥστε συμπρέπε,  
πόλει τ' ἀρήγειν καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων  
βωμοῖσι, τιμὰς μὴ ἔαλειφθῆναι ποτε.

I HAVE been trying to make this out  
legitimately; and by a fair comparison

of the unusual ἀλδαίνειν κακά of 557, I  
can get a sense; but not a good one.  
In this crisis the boys too must fight;  
and so must the old men; but if the  
painful topic of tumours is to be  
broached at all, one would have thought  
that such a handicap to the warrior

would be mentioned as a definitely exempting circumstance, and not as the sole qualification for enrolment. The translators, certainly, do not take it so; but then such sense as they extort from the words *καὶ τὸν ἔξηβον* . . . *πολὺν* is achieved only by inserting a 'but' or 'yet' which is not there.

Also, one would expect, at least, that the description or identification (which is all that is necessary) of the two divisions of irregulars would be evenly balanced. And thirdly, no one has yet succeeded with *ὥστε* (still less with *ὥς τι*) *συμπρεπές*.

The learned propose, or dispose. I transpose.

ὅμῃς δὲ χρὴ νῦν, καὶ τὸν ἐλλείποντ' ἔτι  
ἤβητι ἀκμῆς καὶ τὸν ἔξηβον χρόνῳ,  
ὥραν τ' ἔχονθ' ἑκαστον, ὥστε συμπρεπές  
βλαστημὸν ἀλδαίνοντι σώματος πολύν,  
πόλει τ' ἀρήγειν κτλ.,

*ὥστε συμπρεπές* (ἔστι) being said of course with forward reference to *πόλει τ' ἀρήγειν κτλ.* For my dative compare *Suppl.* 458; and the line is all the neater anyway.

When the inversion had taken place, the eagle eyes of *διορθωταί* detected that the verb *ἀλδαίνειν* must not so accord with *χρόνῳ*. What I, also I hope with at least some small measure of sagacity, observe, is that in the relation to *ὥραν* which I have here bestowed upon it, that verb with its present object is distinctly *συμπρεπές*. As is apt to happen with Greek words, when *ῥα* 'spring' attaches to itself in Attic the metaphorical signification of 'youthful prime',<sup>1</sup> its original sense is not lost sight of; and spring is the season of growth. Accordingly we find *ῥα* associated with *ἄνθος* in (i.) *Plato Rep.* X. 601B 6-7 Burnet, where the phrase *τῶν ῥαίων* . . . *καλῶν δὲ μὴ* makes it evident that neither *ῥα* nor (as will be seen there) *ἄνθος* in this connexion denotes properly beauty, but

rather youthful freshness and vigour; as Stallbaum in fact remarked. Also in (ii.) *id. Rep.* V. 475A 2, where the persons referred to in *τῶν ἀνθούτων ἐν ῥα* are to say the least not all beautiful and include certain *μέλανας, ἀνδρικοὺς ἰδεῖν* and to that extent resembling our young warriors. If *Homer Od.* XVIII. 70 *μέλε' ἤλδανε* and the same line at XXIV. 368 have been cited previously to illustrate this line, that may be now done with propriety; for the associations of the verb in both places are visibly with youth, freshness, strength, and what, whether the fact surprise or not, is evidently in a general way itself associated with these things—namely, *bulk*. And that it is which accounts for our *πολύν*, the only word in my restoration which gave me any real qualms.<sup>2</sup>

It is evident from the Homeric passages that only to old men who have been rejuvenated is the phrase *πολύν ἀλδαίνον σώματος βλαστημὸν* applicable, and old men are only rejuvenated by a miracle. Laertes in the later passage is such an old man; but Odysseus in the other is not; Athena there is virtually reversing her miraculous act of XIII. 397-402; Odysseus is a man in his prime. And in both places, though naturally in different ways, the phrase is associated with the readiness of a man for fighting.

But why labour what is obvious? If *ἀλδαίνοντι* fits the transposition, *βλαστημὸν* confirms it. Our play, lines 533-5:

βλάστημα καλλίπρπον, ἀνδρῶπαις ἀνῆρ.  
στεῖχει δ' οὐλος ἄρτι διὰ παρηίδων,  
ῥα εἰ φουόσῃς, ταρφές ἀντέλλουσα θρίξ.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

*University of Liverpool.*

<sup>2</sup> Because, while men in their prime are bulkier than boys, there are such things as bulky (and still healthy) old men. But indeed, if physiology were to decide the question, the phrase should be *most* applicable to *οἱ ἐλλείποντες ἡβῆς*; since the period of *greatest* growth is (after prenatality) infancy. And these physiological facts are correctly stated by Plato, *Laws* VII. 788D ff. For our poets, however, it suffices that the period when a man has the maximum of healthy muscle to 'feed' shall be regarded as his prime of growth. In old age he may shrink or go puffy.

<sup>1</sup> The transference is direct; not *spring-time* → *prime generally* → *prime of life*, but *spring of year* → *spring of life*. *Eur. Suppl.* 447-9; cf. *εφηβοὶ* . . . *ἐὰν τοῦ δήμου*, *Demades Fr.* 4 S. Cf. the famous simile of Pericles, *Ar. Rhet.* I. 7, 34 and III. 10, 7. *Hdt.* VII. 162 may not be the misapplication it seems, and the concluding sentence of How and Wells's note is instructive in our connexion.



## TWO NOTES.

(I) SOPH. *Trach.* 196-7:

τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἕκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων  
οὐκ ἂν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ' ἡδονὴν κλύειν.

τὸ ποθοῦν has been generally suspected. Jebb favours, though he does not print, E. Thomas's τὰ ποθεῖν. I believe τὸ ποθοῦν to be sound, though it can hardly be, as a scholiast wildly suggests, equivalent to τὸ ποθοῦμενον.

The use of the neuter article with present participle (with or without a defining partitive genitive, γνώμης, etc.), to denote an abstract idea, is well known, particularly in Thucydides (Thuc. I 36. 1: II 59. 3: III 10. 1: VI 24. 2: VII 68. 1: Ant. *Tetr.* Aγ 3: V 73: Soph. *Phil.* 675: Eur. *Hec.* 299). The participle almost always denotes a mental or emotional state: and it is usually in the accusative. (Genitive and dative are perhaps avoided on the ground of ambiguity of gender: but Eur. *Hec.* 299 τῷ θυμουμένῳ: Thuc. III 10. 1 ἐν τῷ διαλλάσσειν τῆς γνώμης. Soph. *O.C.* 1220 hardly, perhaps, comes into question. See Jebb.)

Exact analysis of the idiom is difficult. The original force is clearly 'that part of the being which does so-and-so.' (1) In some passages the participial expression has an almost purely abstract force. Thuc. VI 24. 2 τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦν τοῦ πλοῦ οὐκ ἐξηρέθησαν. Here τὸ ἐπιθυμοῦν virtually stands for τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν: but not quite: 'they did not lose' (not 'their desire for the voyage,' but, more vividly) 'that part of their being which desired the voyage.' (2) In others, 'that part of the person' virtually includes the whole person, and the expression practically means 'the person, in so far as he does so-and-so.' Ant. V 73 κρεῖσσον δὲ χρὴ γίγνεσθαι αἰεὶ τὸ ὑμέτερον δυνάμενον ἐμὲ δικάως σφίξειν ἢ τὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν βουλόμενον ἀδίκως με ἀπολλύναι. Here τὸ ὑμέτερον δυνάμενον stands for ὑμᾶς δυνάμενους, and τὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν βουλόμενον for τοὺς ἐχθροὺς βουλομένους. Cf. Thuc. I 36. 1. It would not, I think, be quite accurate to say that, in such cases, abstract is used for concrete, and that the stages of development are: (i) τὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν βουλό-

μενον; (ii) τὴν τῶν ἐχθρῶν βούλησιν; (iii) τοὺς ἐχθροὺς βουλομένους: though the use of abstract substantives for concrete is as common in prose as in verse, and even Lysias can write (XXIX 6) τὴν ὑμέτεραν ὀργὴν τιμωρεῖσθαι βουλομένην, for ὑμᾶς ὀργιζόμενους, where Antiphon or Thucydides might have written τὸ ὑμέτερον ὀργιζόμενον. Rather (ii) and (iii) would seem to derive independently from (i).

We are concerned here with (2) above. I submit that Sophocles means by τὸ ποθοῦν, roughly, ἐκείνοι ποθοῦντες. That this is in itself (apart from the context) possible, the parallels from Thucydides, a writer whose points of contact with Sophocles are well known, would amply demonstrate. But there is, further, an exact Sophoclean parallel (which, I now find, Campbell quotes, *Introd.* § 30, though in his note on the present passage he apparently falls into the scholiast's error: 'the abstract notion is here put for the object—the desire of knowledge for the knowledge desired'). *Phil.* 675 τὸ γὰρ νοσοῦν ποθεῖ σε ξυμπαραστάτην λαβεῖν. 'I, *qua* sick man' ('my sick estate,' Jebb). It does not then seem by any means 'hardly conceivable' (Jebb) that τὸ ποθοῦν can represent, approximately, ὁ ποθὼν λεώς; but it does seem quite inconceivable that ἕκαστος should stand in partitive apposition, as Hermann thought, since τὸ ποθοῦν essentially is, and remains, an abstract expression, which cannot be parcelled out into particularities. There are, I think, two possibilities. Either (1) τὸ ποθοῦν is accusative: 'Each man, wishing that his eager heart should learn all.' This would scarcely appear ambiguous or obscure to a fifth-century Greek, familiar with the abstract use of the participle. The only difficulty seems to lie in the lack of an object to ἐκμαθεῖν (Ar. *Eccl.* 244 is not quite parallel). But this difficulty does not appear to have been generally felt. Or (2) read ἕκαστον . . . θέλον, with τὸ ποθοῦν nominative: 'Their eager craving, desirous to learn each thing.' A copyist who failed to see that τὸ ποθοῦν was the subject would naturally

supply one by altering ἑκαστον . . . θέλον το ἑκαστος θέλων.

(2) Eur. *Suffr.* 1063-5:

ΕΥ. . . . πόσει γὰρ συνθανούσα κείσομαι.

ΙΦ. Τί φῆς; τί τοῦτ' αἶνιγμα σημαίνεις σαθρόν;

ΕΥ. "Αἰσσω θανόντος Καπανέως τήνδ' ἐς πυράν.

The first line is spoken by Evadne, standing over a sheer drop, with the body of her husband burning on the pyre below; the second by her agonised father, Iphis. Why does Iphis refer to her speech as 'riddling'? How could she have put her meaning less equivocally? The question appears to have been seldom asked. But occasional attempts have been made to neutralise αἶνιγμα, either by emending σαθρόν (σκεθρόν, Naber, which surely cannot be used for σαφές), or by making it mean 'defective,' 'easily guessed.' Thus Wilamowitz, in *Analecta Euripidea*: 'I.e. "quae me celare voluisti apertissime dicis." σαθρόν bene ita dictum, cf. Plat. *Euthyphr.* 5c. Transfertur autem a vasis rimosis.' (Whether a flaw in earthenware is the origin of the trope is perhaps not certain. *Phil.* 55c and *Theaet.* 99d suggest that conclusion; but Plato sometimes gives a new turn to an old metaphor.) But can σαθρόν have this purely intellectual meaning here? In the other Euripidean examples (Aeschylus and Sophocles do not use the word) σαθρός is applied to something immoral or disastrous. *Bacch.* 487 τοῦτ' ἐς γυναικάς δόλιόν ἐστι καὶ σαθρόν: *Rhes.* 639 σαθροῖς λόγοισιν (fair-seeming words which spell ruin: whereas in *Hec.* 1190 σαθροὶ λόγοι are wicked words which do not even seem fair). More natural renderings are 'verdächtig' (Wecklein),

'sinistre' (Parmentier, in the Budé text). But, even if αἶνιγμα σαθρόν can be an out-and-out oxymoron, 'a riddle which is no riddle,' the phrase still seems inapplicable to Evadne's quite unvarnished declaration. If, on the other hand, we read συντακείσα in 1063, αἶνιγμα σαθρόν is perfectly appropriate. Evadne's words are a 'sinister riddle,' but a riddle Iphis can guess, if he dare. She has used the same euphemism in 1029-30 συντηχθεὶς αὔραις ἀδόλοις γενναίας ἀλόχοιο; and συντακείς, with a different sense, comes again in 1106.

The corruption is easy to explain. A familiar word has been substituted for an unfamiliar one. Or perhaps, by haplography, συντακείσα κείσομαι became συντακείσομαι at an intermediate stage.

This emendation had occurred to me before I discovered that Lenting suggested it a century ago (together with the far inferior συμπλακείσα). Editors have almost wholly ignored it, but it is dishonoured by a place among the 'conjecturae minus probabiles' at the end of Wecklein's Latin edition. I do not know where, or how, Lenting supported his reading.

L. 1065 raises another problem. Until a parallel is adduced, one may be permitted to doubt whether τί τοῦτο σημαίνεις; is Greek for 'What do you mean by this?' (τί τοῦτο λέγεις; 'What is this you say?' is clearly different.) Musgrave observes 'legendum cum Marklando σημαίνει, but does not print it. Schenkl also suggested σημαίνει, with the singularly flat σέθεν for σαθρόν.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College,  
Oxford.

# ΣΤΝΕΣΙΣ AND ΣΤΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ.

UNDER the caption σύνεσις Liddell and Scott have the following section: 'III. conscience = συνείδησις, Eur. *Or.* 396, Menand. Incert. 86, Polyb. 18. 26, 13.'

συνείδησις occurs twice only in classical Greek—viz. Democritus, Fr. 297, and Chrysippus *apud* Diog. Laert. VII. 35—and in both cases it means not

Conscience but Consciousness in the broadest sense. (In Chrysippus it refers to the instinctive apprehension of the helpful and the harmful, which he ascribes to all stages of life.) It does not reappear in literature until the Book of Wisdom, where it is found once (XVII. 10), Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Diodorus Siculus. From this time on-

wards it is not infrequent (except in philosophical literature, from which it is consistently absent), though it appears to have been avoided by the purer stylists (e.g. Philo, Plutarch, Simplicius, Chrysostom), who prefer the Attic form τὸ συνειδός. Its primary meaning remains Self-consciousness, not as an abstract faculty, but as introspective awareness of particular states or characteristics of the Self, or of past behaviour regarded as a manifestation of character. 'Conscience' is a secondary meaning involved when such introspection carries with it implicit ethical judgment upon the personal characteristics in question. Frequently used absolutely, with or without an adjective, the word became the closest analogy in Greek to the modern term 'Conscience.'<sup>1</sup>

If, then, Liddell and Scott's interpretation of the above passages is correct, the use of σύνεσις in this sense precedes by several centuries the introduction into literature of συνειδήσις with the same sense. The root-meanings of the two words are different and opposed. σύνεσις is not perception or awareness, but critical intelligence.<sup>2</sup> And it will be argued that there is no sufficient justification for supposing that it ever loses that meaning for the more passive one of 'Conscience.' The passages which call for remark are few. In addition to those already mentioned, I know only of two—namely, Herodian 4. 7, 1, and Philostr. *Vit. Apoll. Tyan.* VII. 7.

1. Eur. *Or.* 395-6 (quoted by Stobaeus, *Floril.* III. 24, under the chapter-title τοῦ συνειδότητος):

MEN. τί χρήμα πάσχει; τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος;  
OP. ἡ σύνεσις, ὅτι σύνοιδα δέιν' εἰργασμένος.

The notion of Conscience is undoubtedly present in this passage. But it does not necessarily follow that it is located in a single word; rather it belongs to the whole sentence. The identification of σύνεσις with the later meaning borne

by συνειδήσις is not necessitated, and while making a fluent and perhaps sufficiently accurate translation for ordinary purposes, nevertheless obscures something of the fulness of the meaning. Conscience has, of course, a twofold meaning: (a) ethical discrimination (the 'moral sense' or apprehension of right and wrong), and (b) an emotion (remorse). The suggested rendering would ascribe to σύνεσις the latter meaning, which is quite foreign to its true significance. The full sense of the passage is the following: Before the slaughter of his mother, Orestes, blinded by his purpose, and pursuing an *idée fixe* to the exclusion of balanced judgment, is able to think upon his proposed deed only as the execution of retributive justice. After its commission and the natural psychological reaction, he recovers the power to contemplate the situation with level-headed sanity and from a wider viewpoint. He understands that, although his mother deserved death, it was a crime *for him* to become the avenger. And with this return of what we should today call the 'social Conscience' he is overcome with horror and contrition. σύνεσις bespeaks the return to level judgment—almost moral sanity or common-sense. In answering the question he gives not the name of his trouble—contrition (although that is implied by the whole reply); but its *cause*—return to normal insight.

2. Polybius XVIII. 26 οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὕτως οὔτε μάρτυς ἐστὶ φοβερὸς οὔτε κατήγορος δεινὸς ὥς ἡ σύνεσις ἢ ἐγκατοικοῦσα ταῖς ἐκάστων ψυχαῖς. It is difficult not to see in this passage an anomaly in the history of the word σύνεσις. It certainly seems to cry out for 'Conscience' in the translation. One might, perhaps, argue that the explanation is to be found along the same lines as that given of the Euripides passage—σύνεσις means cool retrospection, when ethical judgments with remorse, etc., would naturally be brought into play. Personally I find this a too drastic re-reading of the *prima facie* sense of the passage. I would suggest that Polybius had in his mind the Latin *conscientia* (which did duty at this time, especially among the Latin-writing

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article 'Συνειδήσις' in *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1931.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* VI. 11, ἡ σύνεσις ἐστίν . . . περὶ ὧν ἀπορήσειεν ἄν τις καὶ βουλεύσαιο· διὸ περὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μὲν τῇ φρονήσει ἐστίν, οὐκ ἐστὶ δὲ ταῦτ' ὅν σύνεσις καὶ φρόνησις, ἡ μὲν γὰρ φρόνησις ἐπιτακτικὴ ἐστίν . . . ἡ δὲ σύνεσις κριτικὴ μόνον.

Zonaras defines: λογικὴ διάγνωσις ἢ κρίσις ὁρθὴ περὶ τῶν ὑφ' ἑτέρων λεγομένων αἰρετῶν ἢ φευκτῶν. . . . Suidas has: ἐπιληψὶς τῶν πραγμάτων.

Stoics, for both Conscience and Consciousness), and in the absence of a Greek parallel (*συνείδησις* does not appear in literature until nearly two centuries later with this sense) uses *σύνεσις* as a word which, although derived from a different root, would in the context suggest to readers with a Latin background the idea which he wished to convey.

3. In Herodian's *ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἔργων συνέσεως ἐλαυνόμενος* the word has been rendered 'Conscience,' partly from the juxtaposition of *ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις*, and perhaps also through association with Plutarch's phrase *ἐλαυνόμενος τῷ συνειδότι τοῦ πράγματος*.<sup>1</sup> But it may be that this translation renders correctly the intention of the writer, and that the real distinction between the two words was already becoming obscured through debasement of linguistic sense. (Such obscurity certainly prevailed by the time of Stobaeus, who quotes examples of *σύνεσις* under the heading *τοῦ συνειδότος*, and no longer distinguishes between the two forms *τὸ συνειδὸς* and

*συνείδησις*.) But if that is granted, it is valueless as evidence for the use of *σύνεσις* before *συνείδησις* becomes prevalent in literature.

4. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll. Tyan.* VII. 7, a passage describing in popular language the Stoic doctrine of the moral function of Reason in man. Stoic anthropology regarded the Divine Reason implanted in the individual as having a practical and moral as well as an intellectual function. The sense of the present passage demands that *σύνεσις* be Reason or Intelligence, which is asserted (with the Stoics) also to perform the function of Conscience.

5. The verse of Menander rests upon the uncertain authority of Stobaeus, and occurs along with other certainly apocryphal 'quotations.' It could not be regarded as evidential without more reliable support, even were the meaning indisputably in favour of rendering *σύνεσις* by 'Conscience.' At most one can infer with certainty that at a late period the words *σύνεσις* and *συνείδησις* were interchangeable.

H. OSBORNE.

<sup>1</sup> *Publicola* 4.

*Rugby.*

#### ΜΕΤΡΑ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗΣ.

(Herodotus i. 47; Theocritus 16. 60.)

Theocr. 16. 60:

ἀλλ' ἴσως γὰρ ὁ μύθος ἐν' ἥντι κύματα μετρεῖν,  
δοσ' ἀνεμοὶ χέρονται κατὰ γλαυκὰς ἀλὸς ὠθεῖ,  
ἢ ὅσῳι νύξιν θολερὰν διαιδέει πλίνθον,  
καὶ φιλοκέρδει βεβλαμμένον ἄνδρα παρελθεῖν.

How one should misuse one's time upon the waves has, I think, seemed doubtful to nobody. It is by counting them—a suitable occupation for the half-witted, one of whom, a comic poet, Coecylion, if Aelian may be believed (*V.H.* 13. 15), τὰ κύματα ἡρίθμει ὑπὸ τῆς ἄγαν ἀνοίας. *Quem (numerum) qui scire uelit*, says Virgil (*G.* 2. 105), *Libyci uelit aequoris idem | discere quam multae Zephyro turbentur harenas, | aut ubi nauis uolentior incidit Euris | nosse quot Ionii ueniant ad litora fluctus.*

So far so good. But *μετρεῖν* and *ἀριθμεῖν* are not evidently synonyms; and if anyone, dissatisfied with Chalmers' assertion that 'expressions of size and number are constantly confused in Greek,' should repair on his advice to

Lobeck's note on *Soph. Aj.* 130, he will find nothing relevant to this passage except the words: 'μετρεῖν pro ἀριθμεῖν et ἀμέτρητοι pro ἀνάρητοι v. Jacobs ad *Anth. Pal.*, p. 47.' From Jacobs he will cull two late examples of the adjective so used (*A.P.* i. 10. 31, 5. 232) and one (*A.P.* i. 98) in which it means 'endless.' But of the verbs not a word.

There is, in fact, rather more evidence. 'Ἀμέτρητος means 'countless' in some more Byzantine epigrams,<sup>1</sup> at Nonnus 13. 120, and apparently at *Eur. El.* 433 τοῖς ἀμετρήτοις ἔρετμοις. Moreover, Pollux (4. 167) taxes Xenophon with using ἀμέτρους for πολλούς, and *Cyr.* 5. 2. 7 δαρεικοὺς ἀμέτρους τινὰς lends colour to the charge. But for the verb itself the evidence is thin indeed. Stephanus provides only the subscription to the eleventh or twelfth century Paris MS. of Thucydides; Nicet. Eugen. 4. 413. τοὺς ἐφ' ὅψους ἐκμετρήσειν

<sup>1</sup> *A.P.* 5. 300, 15. 48, and perhaps 7. 601.



ἀστέρας, is of no more respectable antiquity; and though Photius writes *μετρήσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀριθμῆσαι* 'Ἀλκαῖος,<sup>1</sup> there are too many contexts in which the words, though not synonyms, may be used indifferently<sup>2</sup> for the statement to carry much weight without the passage upon which it is based.

Since most editors continue to print *μετρεῖν*, it must be supposed that they consider the evidence enough to establish *μετρεῖν* = to count. Perhaps they are right, but I confess that I have never felt very happy about it myself, and the less so since Theocritus could as well have written *ἀριθμεῖν*. Warton, indeed, supposed him to have done so, and this conjecture, improved by Meineke to *ἀμυρεῖν*, has reasonably found some favour. It might be thought to gain something from Schneider's observation (*Callim.* i, p. 384) that to the entry in *Et. Magn.* *ἀμυρήσαι* Σιμωνίδης τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀμυρὸν εἶπε καθ' ὑπέρθεσιν there are added in *Et. Flor.* the words *οἶον κύματ' ἀμυρὸν* (sic). The addition, Schneider suggests, may be a citation not of Simonides but of Theocr. 16. 60. It may; but so may the phrases *κύματα μετρεῖς*, included in a list of proverbs *περὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων* professedly collected from Plutarch and printed in Boissonade *Anecd.* i. 395, and *κύματα μετρεῖ* ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνωφελῶς τι διαπραττομένων in Macarius (*Paroem. Gr.* 2. 182, Leutsch).

My own feeling is, in the first place, that counting the waves as they break on the shore, though a futile, is yet, at any rate in finite time, not a fruitless occupation, and therefore not quite on a par with trying to clean brickbats and to persuade stingy patrons. In the one case the results are excessive, in the others there are no results. Herein, however, it may be that I am captious.<sup>3</sup> In the second place, though waves may be hard to count, any fool can count the sea; and since *μετρεῖν* and its congeners appear in various other meanings in connexion with the

sea, it is worth considering whether one of them will not fit our passage.

First, then, on the analogy of *Od.* 3. 179 *πέλαγος μέγα μετρήσαντες* (ἀντὶ τοῦ διαπεραιωσάμενοι Eustath.), *κύματα μετρεῖν* might mean 'to traverse,' and at *A.P.* 12. 156 the phrase actually occurs in that sense. Here, however, is plainly no symbol of wasted endeavour, for seafaring, given a little skilled assistance, is within anybody's power. In another sense of the words also *θάλασσαν μετρεῖν*, if not for everybody, yet requires you to be but moderately knowing. Δείξω δὲ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης | οὔτε τι ναυτιλίας σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν, says Hesiod (*W.D.* 648), meaning, as presently appears, the sailing seasons. *Μέτρα θαλάσσης* here has points of contact with the Odyssean *ὁδὸν καὶ μέτρα κελεύθου* (4. 389, 10. 539), and again gives us no help. The phrase occurs, however, in a different sense in another passage which seems more promising. It is in the stately profession of omniscience which prefates Apollo's announcement that Croesus is making mutton-and-turtle broth—οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμον τ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης, | καὶ κωφῷ συνίημι καὶ οὐ φωνεῦντος ἀκούω (*Herod.* i. 47). Here, then, is a *μέτρησις* of the sea which is, like counting the sands, a thing beyond human power. The question is what exactly Apollo meant, and whether his *μέτρα* are equally applicable to waves. If so, we have found what we are looking for.

The question, however, though commentators do not seem to have addressed themselves to it, is not altogether simple, for, as a string of adjectives beginning with *a* shows, the unplumbed, salt, estranging sea reminded Greek mortals of their impotence in more ways than one. It is wide enough to be called *ἀπείρων*, *ἀπείριτος*, *ἀπειρέσιος*, and deep enough for Oppian, at any rate, to call it *ἀμετροβαθής* (*Hal.* i. 80 ff.); and, as for its liquid content, οἱ κνᾶθφ μετροῦντες τὴν θάλασσαν<sup>4</sup> misconceive their

<sup>1</sup> The lyric and the comic poet wrangle over this treasure: Kock i, p. 763, Bergk<sup>4</sup> 3, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, Eur. *Tr.* 620, Theocr. 15. 45.

<sup>3</sup> *Anacreont.* 13 (32), 1 εἰ φύλλα πάντα δένδρων | ἐπίστασαι κατεπεῖν, | εἰ κύματ' οἶδας εὐρεῖν | τὰ τῆς ὄλης θαλάσσης at least keeps the shore out of view.

<sup>4</sup> Greg. Naz. *or.* 28, p. 517; Migne 36, p. 64. I leave to others to determine the relations between this phrase, *θάλασσαν ἀντλεῖς* (*Paroem. Gr.* i. 446, Leutsch), and the child who asks St. Augustine *putasne breui immittere nasculo mare totum?* (Molanus, *de Hist. Imag.* 3, ch. 36)

task. Still, in the Mediterranean, if you sail far enough or have a long enough string, you can ascertain a good many dimensions without resorting to omniscience. Moreover, the sea does not invite you to measure quite as the sands invite you to count, and I would rather explain μέτρα in another way.

In a fragment (432 P) of the *Nauplius* or *Palamedes* Sophocles enumerates the discoveries of the latter hero, and asserts that ἐφηῦρε ἀστρον μέτρα καὶ περιστροφάς, where μέτρα seems to mean 'periods'—the rule and order which underlie phenomena seemingly irregular.<sup>1</sup> I suggest that it has that meaning also in the mouth of the Pythia. The sea, too, has 'periods,' harder to discern than those of the stars—periods of rise and fall, 'in the Aegean sea, as in most parts of the Mediterranean, more influenced by wind than by tide,'<sup>2</sup> of currents 'irregular in strength and direction,'<sup>3</sup> of temperature 'very variable from one place to another,'<sup>4</sup> and periods more important still of storm and calm. To know the underlying causes, and to predict the occurrence, of such changes as these is a claim worth making. Moreover, since the omniscience of Apollo on Parnassus must embrace the works of his neighbour on Helicon, I count it an advantage in this interpretation that the god's use of μέτρα will resemble that of Hesiod. Hesiod's μέτρα, too, are 'periods'—the seven summer weeks when, bar accidents, you will be safe, the spring when you run risks, the winter when men stay ashore. Apollo's knowledge is more profound and more minute, but it is of the same nature.

And if μέτρα has this meaning in these places, perhaps the meaning of ἀμέτρητος in another Boeotian poet may be reconsidered. At *Is.* I. 36 Pindar is talking of the coming of Asopodorus to Orchomenus, ἃ νιν ἐρειδόμενον ναναγίαις | ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἀλὸς ἐν

κρυόεσσα | δέξατο συντυχία· νῦν δ' αὖτις ἀρχαίας ἐπέβασε πότμος | συγγενὴς εὐαμερίας. 'Αμέτρητος' is usually supposed to mean 'boundless'; I suggest that it may be a synonym, not of ἀπείρων, but of ἀστάθμητος, for 'irregular,' 'inconstant,' is more suitable to the context, and adds point to the εὐαμερία of the following sentence.<sup>5</sup>

To return to Theocritus. If ἀστρον μέτρα and μέτρα θάλασσης are the underlying symmetries which order the seemingly irregular phenomena of sea and sky, κυμάτων μέτρα should be rules which the waves might obey when, at irregular intervals and in varied size and shape, they break upon the shore or wash against the cliffs. And κύματα μετρεῖν should be to reduce the waves to order, to create or discern a κόσμος in a χάος, to find a formula for all that welter of water. My two crucial instances present the noun, not the verb; but since the genitives dependent on them are objective, the noun implies the verb, and its use is close to that of the other passage in which Theocritus employs it in the active: 10. 39, ὥς εὖ τὰν ἰδεάν τῆς ἁρμονίας ἐμέτρησεν. It remains to add that Virgil, in the passage of the second Georgic quoted above, is usually thought to have Theocritus in mind. It is likely enough he may have, but he is not an infallible guide to the meaning of Theocritus, and this is in any case reminiscence and not translation. Moreover in Virgil the idea of number is essential to the context. In Theocritus it is not; indeed, as I have said, I think it a little disturbing.<sup>6</sup>

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

<sup>5</sup> 'Αμέτρητος as applied to ἀήρ (*Ar. Nuβ.* 264) no doubt means 'boundless': cf. Clem. Al. *Paed.* 2, p. 164, πόντου τε βένθη καὶ δέρος ἀμέτρητον εὖρος. The adjective is applied to the sea also at *A.P.* 9. 34 (Antiphrilos) and 36 (Secundus). Either meaning would do, and such poets as these take their adjectives from the *Gradus*.

<sup>6</sup> I am not concerned with l. 61, and have therefore printed, with Wilamowitz, Bücheler's κατὰ for the μετὰ of the MSS., which presents wind and sea as joint agents in the production of waves. Μετὰ c. *gen.*, though unpopular with Alexandrian poets, occurs at 28. 21; and it may be defensible here, but the parallels adduced by Vahlen (*Hermes* 33. 248) do not advance us much.

<sup>1</sup> Jebb writes 'probably = spatia, not as "distances," but as the "terms" or spaces of time between the risings and settings, etc., as measuring the seasons'; cf. Arist. *de mundo* 397a 9, τῇ κατ' οὐρανὸν τ' ἐστὶ τε καὶ φορὰ τῶν ἀστρον ἡλίον τε καὶ σελήνης κινουμένων ἐν ἀκριβεστάτοις μέτροις ἐξ αἰῶνος εἰς ἕτερον αἰῶνα.

<sup>2</sup> *Mediterranean Pilot*, Vol. IV., p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, p. 10.



COMMISSA PIACULA (VERG. AEN. VI. 569).<sup>1</sup>

THE disputants have now made it clear that *commissa piacula* may legitimately be taken in either of two ways, but neither the one party nor the other has succeeded in removing an uncomfortable suspicion that all is not yet well. 'To confess the atonements incurred which they have put off' is an odd way of saying 'to confess the sins for which they have delayed to make atonement.'<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the explanation revived by Mr. Witton, that *commissa piacula* means 'sins committed' and that *fateri* must be supplied with *distulit*, seems very like a last resort of the desperate, and gives rather a weak sense; it is surely the failure to make atonement on earth, not merely the failure to confess, that gets the guilty spirits into trouble.

*Piaculum* is used of an impious or heinous sin; very frequently the literal meaning, 'sin that calls for expiation,' is quite clearly present. Among the instances cited by Mr. Witton from the *Thesaurus* to show that *piaculum committere* may mean 'to commit a sin' is one from Livy (V. 52. 13, inadvertently cited as IX. 11. 10). For the sake of completeness one may add a less obvious case in Livy of the same expression (not mentioned in the *Thesaurus*). In XXIX. 18. 9, the Locrian ambassadors are complaining that their temple of Proserpine has been robbed by the Roman soldiers. They solemnly warn the senate to make atonement for that crime before using those polluted soldiers in any operations, *ne, quod piaculi commiserunt, non suo solum sanguine sed etiam publica clade luant*. Here

*quod piaculi commiserunt . . . luant* inevitably reminds one of Verg. G. IV. 454, *magna luis commissa*, and in view of the other Livian passage it seems reasonable to take *piaculum* here in the sense of 'impious sin,' 'sin that must needs be expiated.' I venture to think that this is the meaning which the word bears in the passage of Virgil which is in dispute.

What, then, does *quae commissa piacula distulit* mean? Let us look at Ovid, *Rem.* 102:

uidi ego, quod fuerat primo sanabile, uolnus  
dilatatum longae damna tulisse morae.

Here *differre* means 'to put off the treatment of,' 'to delay attending to.' The *Thesaurus* (1076. 55) compares Amm. 27. 7. 4, *serpens uitium et dilatatum* ('not attended to in time'). May not *piacula differre* mean 'to put off attending to sins that call for atonement'? The sense of the passage will then be 'compels confession of the sins which a man . . . has committed and delayed to expiate till death, when it is too late.'

Extended meanings of *differre* are really quite common, and take various forms, some of which are apt to be unnoticed because modern languages can show real or apparent parallels. Tacitus (*Hist.* I. 47) says that Otho when he came into power took no notice of the many insults which had previously been inflicted upon him, and adds: *omississet offensas an distulisset breuitate imperii in incerto fuit*. 'Had postponed his grievances' really means 'had postponed attention to (vengeance for) his grievances.' Many parallels to this sentence could be quoted from Latin both before and after Tacitus. Even in such a familiar use as *consilium differre* = 'to defer the execution of a plan' it is *differre* rather than *consilium* that is used in an extended sense.

W. B. ANDERSON.

University of Manchester.

<sup>1</sup> C.R. LXIV., pp. 5, 170, 171.

<sup>2</sup> Messrs. Wagner and Haarroff, in the November number of the C.R., ingeniously suggest that the passage means 'compels them to confess the incurring of atonements which a man on earth . . . has put off'; but this idiomatic use of the perfect participle and a noun is scarcely possible with such a governing verb as *distulit*. The meaning of the verb is incompatible with the use of this idiom.

ΠΡΟΒΑΤΟΓΝΩΜΩΝ (AESCH. *Agam.* 768).

I HAVE found an illustration of this word in an author who probably had not read the original.

'As four heads is better than two, Sammy,' said Mr. Weller, 'and as all this here property is a very great temptation to a legal gen'l'm'n, ve'll take a couple of friends o' mine vith us, as 'll be wery soon down upon him if he comes anythin' irreg'lar. . . . They're the wery best judges,' added Mr. Weller in a half whisper, 'the wery best judges of a horse, you ever know'd.'

'And of a lawyer too?' enquired Sam.

'The man as can form a ackerate judgment of a animal, can form a ackerate judgment of anythin', replied his father.—*Pickwick*, ch. 55.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

Cambridge.

#### ON HERODOTUS I. 33.

Ταῦτα λέγων τῷ Κροίσῳ οὗτως οὕτε ἐχαρίζετο οὕτε λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται, κάρτα δοξας ἀμαθία εἶναι ὅς τὰ παρόντα ἀγαθὰ μετeis τὴν τελευτὴν παντὸς χρήματος ὅραν ἐκέλευε.

THIS is the usual reading, adopted in the best known editions. But it is difficult Greek, involving a very doubtful use of *οὕτε—οὕτε*; the

first *οὕτε* refers to *ἐχαρίζετο*, the second not to *ἀποπέμπεται*, which is positive, but to the participle *ποιησάμενος*. Stein accepts this use of *οὕτε—οὕτε*, but the passage in Hdt. VIII. 94 to which he refers is scarcely a parallel. The awkward construction is made more awkward still by an abrupt change of subject: the subject of *ἐχαρίζετο* is Solon, and, unless one reads *ἀμαθὴς* for *ἀμαθία*, *ἀποπέμπεται* must have an active meaning, with Croesus for subject.

But even with the reading *ἀμαθὴς* the chief difficulty remains. *οὕτε—οὕτε* is not what is required; the sense requires *οὕτε—τε*. Accordingly one might read *ὁ τε* for the second *οὕτε*: this would make the meaning clear with a very slight alteration of the text, and the change of subject would then be less abrupt; but there is a good example of *οὕτε—τε* with a similarly abrupt change of subject in Hdt. VI. 30: *ὁ δὲ [sc. Histiaeus] οὕτ' ἂν ἔπαθε κακὸν οὐδέν, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἀπῆκε τ' ἂν [sc. Darius] αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίην*. I would propose therefore to read in the passage under discussion: *οὗτως οὕτε ἐχαρίζετο λόγου τε μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται*, etc. The second *οὕτε* might arise from *λόγου τε*, and a mistake on the part of a scribe is the more intelligible in a passage where the construction is a little obscure.

L. I. C. PEARSON.

University of Glasgow.

## REVIEWS

### MINOANS, PHILISTINES, AND GREEKS.

*Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks*, 1400-900 B.C. (The History of Civilization.) By A. R. BURN. Pp. xv + 273; 16 plates, 2 maps. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.; New York: Alfred Knopf, 1930. Cloth, 15s. net.

OF the two parts into which this book is divided, the first discusses the principles adopted in dealing with the evidence, the historical weight to be given to the witness of archaeology, legend, language, physical anthropology, etc., and includes an excellent and sensible estimate of the Homeric Question. This critical section seems to me a very valuable piece of work. The advance of recent study in special fields has been so rapid that perhaps sufficient thought is not always given to the general principles of interpretation, and both archaeology and legend are too often cited as evidence where their nature prevents them from making relevant contribution to the discussion.

A general survey of this kind will therefore be useful both as a stimulus and as a corrective. There are inevitably things in it with which individuals will not agree. I am not personally as convinced as the author of the evidential value of the Thalassocracy List, nor do I agree with him and Mr. T. W. Allen in their view of Dictys. But apart from such matters of opinion the survey as a whole is admirably done. Mr. Burn has clearly a wide knowledge, and he has digested his material. He has imagination, initiative, and ingenuity, but also the saving virtue of common sense. He has the faculty of discerning the real point at issue, and shows a more than ordinary ripeness of judgment. If, as I understand, this is a first book, it is of the very happiest augury.

The second part of the book is an attempt to sketch the political history of the Levant in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages. The story is necessarily speculative, but it was worth attempting, and

the result is interesting. Mr. Burn's archaeological knowledge appears to be up to date, and in particular the importance of the recently acquired Macedonian and Central European evidence is well brought out. The narrative throughout is lively and well written, if occasionally the defects of the quality of liveliness are possibly in evidence. The last chapter displays a genuine sensitiveness to great literature. The accompanying reflections upon Greek religion endorse a fashionable but I cannot help thinking superficial estimate of the religious value of the worship of the Olympian gods. I doubt if Pindar or Aeschylus would have accepted this view as it is stated here.

Inequality of treatment is in part imposed by the nature of the material, but it is perhaps fair criticism that the second part of the book is uneven. I suspect that the author like his critic knows a good deal less about the Philistines and the eastern end of the Levant than he does about the Balkans. But even elsewhere there are patches which are not up to the level of the rest.

The narrative will be provocative of useful reflection by concentrating attention upon big issues. Inevitably it also contains a great many detailed suggestions, many of which are original, and some of which display an ingenuity not unworthy of a pupil of Professor Myres. I do not myself believe in Myres' theory that the story of the Golden Fleece is connected with 'the primitive "grease-process" of mooring fleeces at points where a gold-bearing stream crosses a gravel bed.' It is perhaps worth deprecating that any evidential value should be attached to the legendary history of Rhodes which Diodorus has retailed, apparently from Apollodorus (Bethe in

*Hermes* 24). The papers of Blinkenberg in *Hermes* 48 and 50 have undeniably demonstrated its artificial character. The story of Minos' attack upon the Megarid appears to be an Athenian invention, not a Megarian legend; the purple lock was known to Aeschylus, but the love story and the punishment of Scylla are probably Alexandrine additions. I should agree that the story of Perseus is probably connected with prehistoric contacts between the Argolid and the Levant, but the localisation at Joppa of the Andromeda episode, which probably, but not quite certainly, formed part of the epic of the Gorgon-slayer, is late and without evidential value. The tales of Bellerophon and Perseus belong to the same genus; both were almost certainly the themes of local epics, and hence, as Mr. Burn rightly notes, the allusiveness of Homer's sketch of the Bellerophon plot. In both stories the proportion of purely *märchen* material is much higher than in most Greek legends. On p. 149 it is suggested that the Tereus story supports the view that Thracians once occupied Boeotia. Actually it is more probable that Tereus was first localised at Daulis in consequence of the Thracian theory.

The plates are well chosen and the misprints are few. I noticed references in need of correction on pp. 11 and 27, and the forms Makednian (p. 34) and Minelaos (p. 198). D.S. (Diodorus Siculus—not the Ovidian scholar known to readers of the *C.R.*) does figure in the list of abbreviations, but S.B., also referred to as Stephanos, does not. Is it not simpler, like everyone else, to write Steph. Byz., and in general to employ the accepted conventional abbreviations?

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*King's College, London.*

#### A NEW ANCIENT HISTORY.

*A Survey of Ancient History to the Death of Constantine.* By M. L. W. LAISTNER. Pp. xii + 613; 40 plates and 15 maps. Boston, etc.: D. C. Heath and Co. (London: Harrap), 1929. \$3.80 or 10s. 6d.

PROFESSOR LAISTNER has set himself a difficult task. To survey the history of

the Ancient World in some 600 pages is an undertaking from which the boldest might shrink, the more so if Freeman was right in thinking that no one should write a short history without having previously treated the same period in a longer and more detailed study. The reviewer, moreover, is inclined to quarrel

with Professor Laistner's thesis that it is 'desirable, indeed necessary' that students, attending through a University session an introductory course of lectures on Ancient History, 'should have a textbook or survey to guide them.' A textbook and a survey of ancient history are scarcely synonymous terms. Had it been the reviewer's misfortune to attempt to treat 'Ancient History' in a course of lectures extending over a single year, he cannot help feeling that the 'survey' would have been a task for the lecture-room, the student, in his private reading, being referred to textbooks or other studies on the various subjects and periods which go to make up 'Ancient History,' written by acknowledged experts in their particular sphere. Professor Laistner has, in fact, written a textbook, and a textbook necessarily so compressed that it makes extremely heavy reading, not only for the reviewer but also, we fear, for the one-year student who endeavours to master its contents.

This is the real fault that we have to find with the work; the material to be dealt with is so vast that only rarely does the writer free himself from the shackles of condensation and compression. In an otherwise arid narrative of the oriental kingdoms, which occupies most of the first 117 pages, he is, nevertheless, able to provide a section on Mesopotamian civilisation which stands

out as a model of clear and succinct writing and conveys a lucid picture of the culture of the age of Hammurabi. There is an excellent sketch of the religious festivals of Greece, the political influence of which is well brought out. But the chapter on the philosophy, literature and art of fifth and fourth century Greece is little more than a string of names arranged in chronological order according to subject. Considerations of space render the sketch of early Rome so brief that the republic seems to plunge fully grown into the Carthaginian wars. (Incidentally the statement on p. 391 that the *Comitia tributa* after 287 B.C. became the chief legislative body in the Roman commonwealth is inaccurate and misleading.)

The forty plates with which the book is illustrated are well selected and on the whole well produced; some, e.g. the views of Olympia in plate 17, are blurred, and it is doubtful whether the photograph of the Gortyn inscription (plate 18) serves any useful purpose. There is a well selected bibliography, which should prove useful to the student, who will also find the maps clear and helpful. The binding of the reviewer's copy has been unfortunate, pp. 545-560 having been omitted and their place taken by 577-592, which reappear in their proper place.

H. A. ORMEROD.

*University of Liverpool.*

#### BURY'S SELECTED ESSAYS.

*Selected Essays of J. B. Bury.* Edited by HAROLD TEMPERLEY. Pp. 249; portrait. Cambridge University Press, 1930. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS volume is a collection of ten of Bury's essays, some of them little known or difficult of access, chosen by Dr. Temperley to illustrate at once the development of his ideas and the remarkable range of his historical activities. The first four, dating from the Cambridge Inaugural in 1903 to 1916, deal with the general scope and method of history; the next two with freedom of thought and speech, the special subject so dear to Bury's heart, though the essay on the Trial of

Socrates is too slight to add anything to his reputation; the remainder, more than half the book, deal with Byzantine history, the field in which he did his most characteristic and probably most valuable work, in the sifting of authorities, the narration of facts, the determining of the value of the Empire, both in its influence in the West in the time of chaos and when a new order was being made, and as the bulwark of Europe against the attacks of Islam. The earliest, and longest, of these, on the Emperors from Basil II. to Isaac Komnenos, dates from 1889, and is rather biographical than historical in character. A valuable essay to have



here made easily accessible is his Creighton lecture on the Constitution of the Later Roman Empire. The other two are his introductory Survey of Byzantine History from volume iv. of the *Cambridge Medieval History*, and a much earlier essay, from the *Quarterly Review* of 1900, on the causes of the survival of the Roman Empire in the East; in which, as Dr. Temperley points out, the theory of causation plays a large part, or rather in which his later theory of contingencies plays none. Perhaps the most interesting of all the essays in this volume is 'Cleopatra's Nose,' in which this theory is sketched and illustrated.

All the first four essays throw abundant light on Bury's mind. It is impossible to avoid the thought that he spent too much time on those philosophies of history which he criticised so excellently; which were all based on a *priori* reasoning which was unscientific in just the sense that he most disliked; or that he was himself in danger of making unproved assumptions of the kind that he saw so clearly in others. His insistence on the doctrine of historical relativity, his criticism of men 'under the spell of the present,' who regarded 'the series of what we call ancient and medieval history as but leading up to the modern age and the twentieth century,' was admirable, but his own confidence in the twentieth century (and in the future) and in rationalism was essentially of the same kind. He held that theism, the belief in the possibility of divine intervention, was incompatible with the theory of causation and so with scientific history; but how does that affect the question of its truth? His own doctrine of contingencies, it might

be said, is at any rate difficult to combine with scientific history, in that it makes the discovery of causes all but impossible; but that would not prevent its being true. And his belief in his own age led to a certain lack of sympathy with and understanding of the past: as when he asserts that the modern standard of truth and falsehood in history is something unknown before, or that Thucydides supposed the only value of history to lie in its examples and warnings to future statesmen. Even if Thucydides meant no more than that, it would only show that he worked better than he knew. Many great men have done that; for all we know, Homer himself may have believed that the only purpose of his epics was to teach lessons in the military art.

There is much in these essays that touches on the somewhat barren controversy on history as a science or an art: barren because it depends on the contestants using all three terms in different senses. There is an interesting instance of that here: Dr. Temperley illustrates the ever-fresh activity of Bury's mind by the fact that he, who had most insisted that history was 'a science, no less and no more,' could write towards the end of his life that freedom from bias in history is neither possible nor desirable. To illustrate the first statement, he asserts that Mommsen's greatness as an historian is to be sought not in his *Roman History*, but in the *Corpus* and the *Staatsrecht* and the *Chronicles*; to illustrate the second, he again quotes Mommsen, but this time of course Mommsen of the *Roman History*.

A. W. GOMME.

*University of Glasgow.*

#### MYTHOLOGY AND RELIGION.

*Greek and Roman Mythology.* By WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX. Pp. lxii + 402; 62 plates and 11 figures in text. London: Williams and Norgate, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THE author of this work, which, as I gather from the Preface, p. xi, is one of a series of volumes presumably dealing

with the various mythologies, is President of the University of Western Ontario, London (Canada). His intention (p. ix) is 'to present and interpret a number of the typical myths of Greece and Rome as vehicles of religious thought; that is to say, in the discharge of their original function.' It is not,

NO. CCCXXX. VOL. XLV.

B

then, a handbook of mythology in the ordinary sense, and does not pretend to include or mention every myth, though a great number are to be found in it, either told at length or referred to in passing. The illustrations are for the most part good, and the author has been at pains to choose as many as possible from among the less known works of ancient art. There is therefore much good material in this volume, and the arrangement, although, as the author frankly points out (p. ix), it reverses the usual one and puts the gods after the heroes, is quite intelligible. Clearly the compilation has been a labour of love, and very considerable knowledge of the subject is shown, both in the mass of facts adduced and in the selection, usually judicious, of the authors from whom they have been drawn. The chief formal complaint to be made is that the references are scanty, the reader seldom being informed who among the ancients tells the story that is under discussion.

If, despite these undeniably good points, the book can hardly be called a success, the reasons are as follows: In the first place, the author fulfils his promise of treating the myths as vehicles of religious thought in a rather scrappy way, some being interpreted in this manner, others, especially the sagas, given a few remarks on their historical content, without making it clear what bearing any religious idea had upon the preservation of the tradition or the manner of its telling, while others again are merely told without comment. Secondly, the number of inaccuracies and slips in the narrative is far too great. To write a book of this kind without making mistakes among the hundreds or thousands of details which must be presented is, indeed, next to impossible, as the reviewer knows from experience; but it ought to be no very difficult task to sketch, for instance, the outline of the Homeric poems without such slips, and this has not been done: thus on p. 127, the reader who does not know his Homer is left to imagine that Agamemnon seriously intended to flee on the morning after his dream; that fighting had gone on for some time before Hektor proposed the duel between Paris

and Menelaos; that there was no violation of the truce by Pandaros; and later (p. 129) that Achilles himself wielded the fires which delivered him from the attack of Skamandros; that the death of Hektor (p. 130) was not brought about by any intervention on Athena's part; and that Hektor's body was mutilated by the victor. Thirdly, and this is by far the most serious fault, the author seems to lack that experience in handling mythical material which would enable him to distinguish the true stuff of myth from the tasteful or tasteless embroidery added by poets and grammarians. Hence, for instance, when he tells (p. 36) the tale of the contest between Dionysos and Perseus, he begins by saying that it 'has all the marks of great age,' which may be true, for traces of it have been found as far back as the sixth century B.C., in art, although not in literature; it may well be a genuinely old Argive tradition. But he then goes on to tell the story in the fantastic and silly guise given it by Nonnos, long after the last breath of really popular or classical invention was stilled. Later (p. 248) he mentions Hesperos; but the story he tells of him is no popular myth at all, but a bit of Euhemerism from Diodoros of Sicily (111. 60, 2-3). So also on p. 253, we hear that 'myth' credited Linos with being the first to use letters, and styled him a grammarian, and so forth. The unsophisticated reader will form strange opinions of the mythopoeic faculty of Greece if he supposes this pseudo-history to be a product of it.

The bibliography suffers from a rather curious defect; it seems to contain nothing or almost nothing of later date than 1915. But this is excused if we consult the Preface (p. xi), which states that 'owing to the baffling delays of war-time,' Vol. I. of Cook's *Zeus* did not reach the author till it was too late to make much use of it. It would appear, then, that the work was written about 1915 or 1916. The delay in publishing, for this seems to be the first edition, is nowhere mentioned or explained.

H. J. ROSE.

*St. Andrews University.*



## TECHNICAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF THE ANCIENTS.

*The Technical Arts and Sciences of the Ancients.* By ALBERT NEUBURGER. Translated by HENRY L. BROSE, M.A., D.Phil., F.Inst.P. Pp. xxxii + 518; 676 text-blocks. London: Methuen and Co., 1930. 42s. net.

I HAVE never come across such a lot of nonsense as is strung together in this book. It doubtless contains some sense as well, but how can that be recognised in such company? A series of statements without reasons or references can only be checked by superior knowledge, and where you have that you do not want a book. Statements that cannot be checked are not acceptable in archaeology. The publishers say in their advertisement on the wrapper: 'This work, which is a peculiarly readable example of German thoroughness, occupied the author more than twenty years and involved the study of literally thousands of other writings.' But let the author speak for himself. *Of Metallurgy* (p. 9): 'The wealth of Egypt, or rather Ethiopia, was supposed to have been so great that, according to Herodotus' narrative, even the prisoners were bound with chains of gold. As no such golden slave-chains have ever been discovered, this tale is best consigned to the region of fancy.' (P. 15): 'Bronze, at that time called brass, and undistinguished in name from copper.' 'Tin and lead were often confused in antiquity; this is easy to understand, seeing that analysis in our sense was unknown at that early date, and that metals were often distinguished only by their outward appearance.' (P. 18): 'Lead played an extremely important part over the whole period of ancient history. It was known even to the early Egyptians, Indians and Jews.' *Of Fermentation* (p. 104): 'The ancient Germanic beer, for the preparation of which the yeast was spontaneously supplied by the air.' (P. 105): 'The god of wine was celebrated in Greece and Rome by special festivals, in which feelings ran so high that there have probably never in later times been occasions which

could compare with them in immorality, riotous behaviour, and extreme debauchery.' At this point even the translator is moved to interject a mutinous footnote: 'A gross exaggeration.' But I regard the translator as a sort of hero, a scientific Casabianca. *Of Ceramic Arts* (p. 131): 'In all fired clay of the first period, no matter whence it is derived, we find one and the same sign, namely the Swastika. It suggests that the cradle of the clay industry was in Asia Minor or in Egypt.' (Pp. 142-3): 'Only recently more attention has been paid to the ancient Greek ceramic art by the technical scientist. In general, Greek vases are black, brown or red, and are more or less polished. At the end of the third century B.C. a glaze appeared on them. The painting was carried out on the moist clay, which rapidly absorbed the colour. The figures were protected during the process so that they appeared yellow or red on the black background. The black colour is always applied so thinly that it does not stand out in relief. Many colours, particularly yellow, were always applied under the glaze.' *Of Elasticity* (p. 220): 'The full strength of a man was needed to produce the necessary tension for shooting [with an East Indian compound bow]. The arrow would then travel over thirty yards.' 'The arrow despatched by a composite bow can fly as far as a thousand yards, and is capable of shooting right through a bison, as is known from an investigation of the bow of the Sioux Indians.' The number quoted in the first of these two ridiculous statements has evidently dropped a cipher at some stage of its twenty years gestation, but nobody concerned in the production of this text can take refuge in a misprint, for the German edition (1919) gives the same number. Three hundred yards was actually about the limit of range of the English longbow, and even the powerful Turkish bow has rarely driven a flight-arrow beyond six hundred, as the inscribed records of the Ok-Meidan testify. It looks as if curiosity and

scepticism, Gibbon's 'nerves of the mind,' without which no science is possible, are as well served by a classical education as a scientific one. But

neither I nor the author need say any more. A book to be used with caution, if at all.

E. J. FORSDYKE.

British Museum.

## TWO ANTHOLOGIES OF GREEK VERSE.

*The Hundred Best Poems (Lyrical) in the Greek Language.* By HUGH MACNAGHTEN. London and Glasgow: Gowans and Gray, 1930. Pp. xv+65. Paper, 1s.; cloth, 2s.

*The Oxford Book of Greek Verse.* By GILBERT MURRAY, CYRIL BAILEY, E. A. BARBER, T. F. HIGHAM and C. M. BOWRA. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930. Pp. xlviii+608. Cloth, 8s. 6d. (Indian paper, 10s.) net.

THESE volumes will be very pleasant possessions for all those lovers of Greek—and they are many—who do not scorn anthologies. Macnaghten's possesses a peculiar interest, especially for those who knew him, as the swan-song of a very delicate and lovable scholar.

Restricted by his title to lyrical pieces, Macnaghten gave the term a fairly wide interpretation and included selections from the elegists, Homer, Menander and others—even a page of Xenophanes (who is only allowed four lines by the Oxford selectors) on the superiority of mind to muscle. Maybe he was partly impelled to this catholicity by the fragmentary state of our melic texts, on which he seems to have held an almost extreme view, since he inserted only ten lines of Alcaeus and not a line of Alcman's longest surviving poem. But possibly fuller study would discover in him some peculiar aversion for these authors. One of the charms of anthologies is that they afford material for inferences about the mentality of the selector.

In the case of the Oxford Book, this problem is different and more complex, since we have to do with five selectors, and the brief Preface is severely reticent about the distribution of their functions. A hasty inspection suggests that, committee-like, they compromised their differences by agreeing on a selection roughly in proportion to the surviving output of each author—of the best

periods, of course. For example, Homer is represented by 109 pages, Alcaeus by 5, Pindar by 42, Aeschylus and Sophocles by 39 apiece, and Euripides by 69. Macnaghten gives 6 pages of Aeschylus and 2 apiece of Sophocles and Euripides, having perhaps a freer hand and the support of the Aristophanic chorus (*Frogs*, 1254), according to whom the μέλη of Aeschylus were at once *πλείστα* and *κάλλιστα*. But of course the Oxford selectors are not restricted to μέλη, and in tragedy, as elsewhere, their choice seems to me on the whole—of course every reader has his own sympathies and antipathies—to be judicious and representative. And Mr. Bowra's Introduction—a distillation of the history of Greek poetry into 42 pages—is something of a masterpiece, well-proportioned, thoughtful, and penetrating.

The Preface tells us that 'in the case of corrupt passages, the selectors have not scrupled to emend freely, feeling that a readable text is the first requisite of a book like this.' I fancy this part of the work must have been done individually and not in committee; for, though the governing principle is reasonable enough, I have noticed some cases in which the worse emendation, as it seems to me, has been preferred to the better. I can hardly believe that five distinguished scholars agreed, even by a bare majority, to read at *Agam.* 316

ἔστρυνε θεσμὸν μηχανήσασθαι πυρός,

introducing the idea of a lengthy process where swiftness is essential, and that with Casaubon's *χρονίζεσθαι* ready to hand. I thought, too, that the same play had been finally relieved by Headlam of lines 891-3 (= 900-902); but here they appear at the end of an extract, where they might have been omitted without prejudice to the question of reading and with benefit to the reader. And freedom is surely carried too far in printing (in Alcaeus' *Ship of State*)

στίχει, παρέξει δ' ἄμμι πόνον πόλυν.  
φαρξώμεθ' ὡς ὠκιστα τοίχοις,

as consecutive lines, when, even if both belong to the same poem, a gap between

them is certified both by the papyrus and by Heracleitus.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

University of Glasgow.

#### A FRENCH EDITION OF XENOPHON'S ANABASIS.

Xenophon, *Anabase* I.-III. Texte établi et traduit par PAUL MASQUERAY. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 30 fr.

PROFESSOR MASQUERAY has produced a book that cannot fail to prove attractive and interesting to scholars and amateurs alike. Those who have themselves meddled with the problems of the *Anabasis*—so many of them insoluble—will best appreciate the extent of the editor's learning and the sanity of his judgment. And frequently his learning is illuminated by flashes of wit. The translation is elegant, and the introduction and notes are illuminating.

It is, of course, impossible to produce a reliable text. Amid the innumerable contradictions of our manuscripts, as the editor says, the most we can hope for is to recover in part what Xenophon wrote. Professor Masqueray has done well to avoid the expressions *mel.* and *det.* in his critical notes. Is it not time that these labels, first assigned by Dindorf to two classes of MSS. that are now known to be about on a level as regards reliability, were discarded? Professor Masqueray has made good my deficiencies by collating the two most important representatives of the so-called *deteriores*, *Vaticanus* 1335 (F) and *Venetus Marcianus* 511 (M); and he has made a fresh collation of *Parisinus* 1641 (B), the copy of C that contains the conjectures of Michael Apostolios. True, these labours have made no difference to the text itself, but they have put the testimony of the *deteriores* on a solid basis; and some of the conjectures of Apostolios which were not previously known are worth having.

The editor has not slavishly followed the first hand of *Parisinus* 1640 (Cpr.). Thus, at I. iv. 5 he gives in the text *βιασάμενοι τοὺς πολεμίους παρέλθουσιν*, where Cpr.BAD have *βιασάμενος*

(-όμενος Dindorf) *τοὺς πολεμίους*: at II. v. 14 *εἰ μὲν βούλοίῳ τῷ φίλος εἶναι*, ὡς μέγιστος ἂν εἴης, though Cpr. omits *τῷ* and *εἶναι*: at II. iv. 12 *μήκος . . . εἴκοσι παρασαγγῶν (παρασάγγαι Cpr.)*.

At II. i. 2-3 he gives *πέμποι* and *λέγοι* with FM instead of *-ει*: so should I do now. But in a similar sentence at II. ii. 15 he retains *οὐχ ἵππεῖς εἰσιν ἀλλ' ὑποζύγια νέμονται*, and that although *-σιν* is in an erasure in C. There are other places in which I cannot see eye to eye with him, especially in tiny matters of spelling; and I have little doubt that, with Hude for editor, a good many words would be spelt differently. But I will confine myself to a few passages, about which something must be said.

At III. ii. 37 surely Cobet's *δύο τῶν πρεσβυτάτων στρατηγῶν* is right for *δύο τῶν -ων -ῶν*. In this same passage the optatives *ἡγοῦτο, ἐπιμελοίσθην, ὀπισθοφυλακοῖμεν* are unlikely after *ἄλλως ἐχέτω*, and are out of place in an exhortation.<sup>1</sup> I should now read *ἡγήσθω* (with M corr. and Apostolios), *ἐπιμελείσθων, ὀπισθοφυλακῶμεν*. I have never been able to see any point in Matthiae's *γε* for *τε* at III. iv. 16 (*οἳ τε Ῥόδιοι κ.τ.λ.*): it is judiciously ignored in the translation. The text is in a muddle here, and *τε* should be ejected. Why is *κελεύει δέ οἱ συμπεμψαί* altered to *κ. δὲ οἱ σ.* at III. iv. 42? The editor refers us to I. i. 8 for *οἱ*, but the pronoun there is emphatic, being contrasted with *Τισσαφέρην*. At II. v. 18 the editor has made a statement, instead of a question, out of *τοσοῦτοι δ' εἰσὶ ποταμοί, ἐφ' ὧν ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.* He renders *Les fleuves sont si nombreux que sur leurs berges il nous est loisible*, etc.; but

<sup>1</sup> Dindorf compares *de re eq.* I. 17 *θαρρύντες δοκιμάζομεν*, where he himself conjectured *δοκιμάζομεν ἂν* (*leg. θαρρῶν τις δοκιμάζοι ἂν*), and Plato, *Latius* 879c *διυναθίσθω . . . ἀπέχουτο . . . ἀπείργουτο* (*leg. ἀπέχτω . . . ἀπείργτω*). The matter is different in poetry.

this would require ὥστ' ἐπ' αὐτῶν for ἐφ' ὧν. At II. vi. 19 οὐ μέντοι αἰδῶ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἑαυτοῦ . . . ἱκανὸς ἐμποιῆσαι, the ἑαυτοῦ depends on αἰδῶ, not, as it is rendered, on στρατιώταις. In the desperate passage at III. iv. 21 Professor Masqueray borrows something from both classes of MSS., and puts up an ingenious explanation. But his explanation requires us to assume that the words πορευόμενοι οἱ λοχαγοὶ ὑπέμενον ὕστεροι, τοὺς δὲ παρῆγον can mean 'the lochagi marked time if they were in the rear, while in front they made their men pass'; and I fear that this is not the only objection to his solution of the problem.

Hude's emendation ἀπορία (for ὑποφία, in *ras. praeter accentum et a C*) appears in the text at III. i. 21. Hude threw it out during a talk with me some thirty-five years ago, and I was the first to record it. Recently he wrote to me and asked where I found it! I am sure that it is his, and, comparing §§ 2 and 11, confident that it is right. I will add one suggestion that I can claim as my own: At III. i. 6 ἀνείλεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀπόλλων θεοῖς (θεοὺς Buttman) οἷς ἔδει θύειν we should expunge θεοῖς; cf. the preceding sentence and § 8.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

### THE GROWTH OF PLATO'S IDEAL THEORY.

*The Growth of Plato's Ideal Theory: An Essay.* By SIR JAMES GEORGE FRAZER, O.M. Pp. xi + 114; reproduction in facsimile of first page of MS. London: Macmillan, 1930. 7s. 6d.

THIS essay on the development of Plato's metaphysical thought is, it seems, more than fifty years old. Sir James Frazer tells us that it is substantially identical with a thesis which he submitted as a B.A. to the examiners for fellowships at Trinity College, Cambridge; and that, apart from a few small corrections, he has not attempted 'either to improve the matter or to polish the style.' He says that, if he rewrote the essay now, he would put the Platonic dialogues in a rather different chronological order, in particular that he now considers the *Phaedrus* and the *Theaetetus* to be later than the *Republic*. 'But,' he adds, 'any such changes in the dating would not materially affect my conclusions, which are based directly on Plato's own words and on nothing else.' The last three words, which we have italicised, should not perhaps be taken too literally; but, so far as they are justified, they should surely weaken, rather than strengthen, the author's confidence in his conclusions.

If we think of some of the books which have been written in these fifty years, of the immense growth of interest in philosophical problems generally and

in Greek philosophy in particular, it would indeed be surprising and, in a sense, disappointing to find that an essay on Plato's metaphysics needed only some such slight rectification after all, even when every allowance has been made for the fact that its author was J. G. Frazer, B.A. But in truth, though Sir James Frazer, O.M., may still see Plato much as that young man saw him, this is no longer possible for most of us. For one thing, the metaphysics of J. S. Mill are no longer the mode, and therefore the approach is fundamentally different. The interest in the book will be more for the light it throws on its author than for the light it throws on its subject. From the essay it is in fact sufficiently obvious that young Mr. Frazer was an excellent scholar, who had read his Plato with care and attention; but it is not equally obvious that he possessed the philosophical equipment necessary for his difficult task. Further, it is inevitable that a generation brought up on Burnet should find a whole mass of uncriticised assumption, particularly as to the Socratic-Platonic relation, pervading the argument of the work. Since this was inevitable, it is hard to understand why in this year of grace Sir James Frazer has decided to print this youthful essay for the first time. What does he hope for it? What degree of responsibility does he take for it? Is he



still, for instance, prepared to defend a palpable absurdity (as it seems to us) like his reference (p. 64) to 'the acknowledged failure of the Greeks in natural

science'? To these, as to many other questions about the book, we can suggest no answer.

J. L. STOCKS.

University of Manchester.

### THE CHARACTERS OF THEOPHRASTUS.

*Theophrastus: Characters.* With an English translation by J. M. EDMONDS. (With *Herodes, Cercidas*, etc., by A. D. KNOX.) Pp. vii + 132 (and xxvi + 365). London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

THEOPHRASTUS' *Characters* is notoriously a work which gives an editor every chance to display learning and ingenuity. In these qualities Mr. Edmonds in his share of this curiously assorted Loeb volume does not fall short of his predecessors. Attention is at once challenged by the introduction, in which a new theory of the history of the text is advanced.

Taking a hint from some observations of Professor A. C. Clark on certain Cicero manuscripts, Mr. Edmonds finds that omissions and transpositions in various MSS. seem to involve a unit of about 11 letters. Chiefly from this he draws conclusions which may be briefly summarised as follows: (1) The archetype (papyrus-roll of the fifth century) had 11-12 letters to the line and a column of 12-13 lines; (2) this format was to some extent preserved in MSS. intermediate between the archetype and our existing MSS. Also he believes that there are traces of a pre-archetype with 17-18 letters to the line. Such a summary can give no idea of the skill and force of Mr. Edmonds's exposition; particularly interesting is the evidence for possible perpetuation of format in other authors. (In passing, is it fair to ask whether the argument that references such as *κατὰ τοὺς ἑξακοσίους στίχους* 'could only be of value if the format were fixed' would, if applied to such references as 'Plato, *Rep.* 557B,' show that all our texts of Plato correspond page for page?)

'I can hardly expect my critics,' says Mr. Edmonds, 'to write out the whole book, as I have done, in 12-14-line columns of 11-12-letter lines . . . ,

but if they would—!' I must confess I have not accepted the challenge. But Mr. Edmonds may be supposed to have adduced the best of the evidence. In support of the 11-12 letter line he brings forward 12 passages. Let us grant that he is right in supposing with Immisch against Diels and Navarre that CD are independent authorities, in supposing that CD (and therefore AB) do not give a shortened text in I.-XV. as they do in XVI. ff. Even so, over half his twelve passages seem to me very doubtful. Two (of little weight in any case) suppose an 11-letter latest common ancestor of AB. But this must have been minuscule (cf. *δρῶναι* for *θρῶναι* VI. 9), and a minuscule MS. of a classical author with such an arrangement is surely improbable. One is an omission of 11 letters in a definition in the Munich epitome; it also shortens the definitions in IV. and VI.—not by 11 letters. Two are omissions in CD; CD in the *Characters* concerned give a shortened text, the maker of which had as one of his principles to omit what he did not understand; obscurity clearly caused both these omissions. Two transpositions of a single word in CD, both in sentences where omissions have been made, may easily be due to the whim or carelessness of the maker of the recension. This leaves two repetitions in V (of 35 and 45 letters respectively), one omission of 11 letters in AB, a repetition and an omission, each of 12 letters, in D. Possibly this residue is evidence enough to establish an 11-letter archetype—I must admit that I cannot find even as much for any other length of line—but it brings no support to the idea of a regular preservation of format.

Yet, even if one allows that the archetype contained 11 letters to the line, would 'the importance, to emendation, of the line-unit' be 'clear'? Clear, surely, only in those few passages

where there is only one witness to the archetype; where there are two independent witnesses, the chances against their omitting or transposing the same line must be enormous. It would be more important to know the line-unit of the MS. from which the archetype itself was copied.

In actual practice Mr. Edmonds does not make excessive use of his theories in producing his text. Emendations there are in plenty; with an author whose text is as bad as that of the *Characters* may be suspected to be this is justifiable; many of them might be as wonderfully confirmed by a papyrus find as Cobet's disregarded Πέρσας ένυφασμένην for Π. ένυφασμένους έχουσαν in V. 9. Perhaps I may give a few examples of the many valuable suggestions: ἐπι<γελάν> I. 2, στρατιώτης <τις> VIII. 4, έν<ί> τινι XIII. 3, εαντού <πλέον τάλάντου> XXII. 10, <είπειν> άκουε δή for ούκούνδε XXVIII. 2. A noticeable feature is the use made of the Munich epitome. Immisch's usually conservative text recognises in a number of places that this epitome preserves words lost in the other MSS. Mr. Edmonds carries this recognition to its logical conclusion by admitting

<έτι> βουλεύεσθαι I. 4, <ού καιρίων ή> μακρών III. 1, <ούχ> ύει XVII. 4, but beyond it, as it seems to me, by reading έκ τών στρωμάτων γυμνός XVIII. 5, βηματίση for περιπατήση XX. 4 (βηματίση may be the rarer word, but the required sense, 'take a stroll,' is Byzantine). Again, is κέραμος for δεσμοτήριον (VI. 6) genuine Attic slang or only grammarians' alleged Cypriote?

Since this Loeb is addressed to scholars, not merely to the general reader, the critical notes might have been cast in a form that scholars could use. To give nearly all variants as being in 'some MSS.' is merely annoying. To enumerate would take no more space. The note on XVIII. 6 makes it impossible to find where the MSS. place τοῦ κναφέως; that on XXV. 2—'MSS. ανακόπτοντος (ανάκντων μὲν) πνιθαν. (αἰσθάν.)'—obscures the truth—ανάκόπτοντος αἰσθάνεσθαι C, ανακύντων μὲν πνιθάνεσθαι V. But in spite of such obstacles, no one will be able to afford to neglect Mr. Edmonds's text, while the translation is both readable and accurate.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

#### THE GREEK CHOLIAMBIC POETS.

*Herodes, Cercidas, and the Greek Choliambic Poets (except Callimachus and Babrius).* Edited and translated by A. D. KNOX. (Loeb Classical Library.)<sup>1</sup> London: Heinemann, 1929.

A WIDE knowledge of Greek rather than a deep feeling for it, a real originality sometimes sinking, for lack of a sense of proportion, to mere freakishness, a good literary judgment warped too often by an impulsive egotism, and a caution which would be modest if it were not so intransigent, have somehow combined to make this an extremely valuable work.

I begin with HIPPONAX and ANANIUS. Here it is not too much to say that the editor's intensive study of the early users of the iambic, and his careful appraisalment of the sources of the citations,

have thrown a new light on the text. It is a comparatively small matter that hereabouts, as sometimes elsewhere, the book is difficult to read. The use of brackets and daggers is over-conscientious; one has often to look long and far before one finds the Greek which corresponds to the English; the reader too often feels that he is reading material for a text rather than an actual text. In a Loeb volume it is perhaps more important that the translation, though often very spirited, is sometimes so fettered by the needs of the metre—a not unsuccessful adaptation of the original—that it is unintelligible without the Greek.

The following points call for consideration in a future edition: P. 15, n. 1 In Theophr. *Char.* 20. 7 ή μαία would not suit the context.—P. 18. 10 προς τὸ λύχρον means 'in the light of

<sup>1</sup> For the other contents of this volume see p. 23.—EDD.



the lamp,' not 'facing the lamp'; cf. *Ar. Nub.* 771, *Pac.* 567, *Vesp.* 772, *Eccl.* 64.—11 *μακρὸς* δ' τις points to *μάκρ' ὅστις*; cf. *Archil.* 80. 5 Diehl, *Sol.* 14 Bgk.—P. 24. 24 Despite *ῥηματικὸν ὄνομα*, Meineke's *κρίγη* 'owl' (so Hesych.) deserved mention.—27 n. and p. 26. 31 n. The statements 'ὥσπερ requires a main verb,' and 'the initial trochee may be supported from Herodes'<sup>1</sup> need support.—P. 30. 38 n. The supposition 'Εφευσίη (sic) would not be passed by any philologist.<sup>2</sup>—P. 32. 44-6 and 54 The editor appears not to have consulted W. M. Ramsay *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation*, nor indeed any authority on Lydian.<sup>3</sup>—P. 42. 59. 3 How does the editor take the genitive *τοῦτέρου τοίχου*?—P. 42. 60. 4 and n. Does not *ῥίγγυται* stand for *ῥηγνύται*, subjunctive? Cf. Kühner-Blass I. 2. 191. 3.—P. 46. 67 n. *πᾶσι πονηροῖσι* could hardly stand for 'all ills.'—P. 46. 68. 6 Bergk's *δήκη* deserved mention; cf. Hesych.—P. 50. 71 The treatment of *πᾶσα ἀθηνᾶ μαλὶς κόνισκε* (glossed *χαίρε*) is unsatisfactory; in view of 92, which appears to have been added in proof, the editor would now perhaps consider the old suggestion that we have some Lydian here.<sup>4</sup>—P. 55. n. 1 Is *τὸ σεῦ δὲ χεῖλος* sufficiently supported e.g. by 82 *οἱ δὲ μεν ὀδόντες*? And is the heron rightly described as a diving bird?—P. 56. 82 *τοῖσι* (for *ταῖσι*) *γνάθουσι* (so read accent) is probably due to late confusion with *γναθμός*; cf. Steph.—P. 60 n. (cf. p. 68, 3 n.) 'Ananias avoided all choliambi but those which ended with four long syllables'; yet of the thirteen extant lines three have an iambus in the fifth foot, which is nearly 25 per cent.

Fr. 53 (p. 36) is almost hopelessly corrupt, but Bergk's *φῆ* (= *ὥς*) for *οὖς φησι* deserved mention. Adopting this and ousting *καί* below, perhaps we might read *κνίζων φελίζων* with asyndeton (cf. *ἄνω κάτω, ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν, and ἀγομαί φέρομαι* *Ar. Nub.* 24, *ἀγόμεθα*

*φερόμεθα* *Eur. Tr.* 1310), and accept Mr. Knox's *χόρτον*, but in the older sense of 'feeding-ground' (here in *mal. part.*). With *φελίζων* cf. cognates of *φαλλός* ap. Boisacq, or read for it *ψελίζων* (sugg. Knox from Hesych. *ψελιστήν*) comparing *ψάλλω*. This will require *μητροκοίτας* to be taken as nominative and (probably) changed to *-της*.—In Fr. 70 (p. 48 and Add., p. 354) it is by no means clear what the man is doing; but *στέγη* is rather more likely to mean 'roof,' and Hesych. *ὀφελμα· κάλυμμα*, i.e. 'boarding' (cf. Studniczka on Theophr. *Char.* 10. 6) may point to roof-mending rather than house-sweeping or pavement-laying—'mending the roof with a stump of broom (the shrub) for lack of a bit of board'—so poor was, or wished to appear, the wine-seller, and therefore unable to pay the debt the three witnesses were brought to prove. There may well be a play on the two words *ὀφελμα*; cf. Boisacq.—P. 27, n. 1 If Hipponax never used a fifth-foot spondee, *θερμαίνων* has perhaps ousted *ἐξοπτέων*.

I correct the following minor errors: P. 36. 53 *context*, before *ἐλλίζων* insert Hesych.—P. 25. 25 transpose blood and bile.—P. 26. 28 n. for *Ar. Av.* read *Ar. Lys.*—P. 50. 72 read *ὀλίγα*. At Fr. 43 and 52 some indication should be given that the *Chiliades* are written in verse. And why is *ἐν πρώτῳ ἰάμβῳ* never rendered 'in his first iambic poem'? It perhaps filled a whole book; hence this form of reference.

In HERODAS again, although the end is not yet, there is a very distinct advance. The editor has grappled bravely with most of the palaeographical problems, and—as will happen as familiarity with a hand grows upon its investigator—has been obliged to discard many of his earlier readings and supplements.<sup>5</sup> That his *δεύτεραι φροντίδες* extend to the Appendices and Addenda of this edition should in the circumstances be accounted unto him for righteousness, and only those who have not dealt with the Papyrus at first hand will presume to throw a stone. All the same, this reviewer cannot forbear a

<sup>1</sup> Presumably from I. 67, where for *Γυλλί* Stobaeus has *γύναι*.

<sup>2</sup> Nor, I think, the philological basis of the note on p. xxii.

<sup>3</sup> For *καίης* = 'priest' cf. *Am. Journ. Arch.* 1913, 362 and *Sardis* vi. 2 Index iii. 25, references which I owe to Mr. W. H. Buckler.

<sup>4</sup> So also ap. *Sardis* l.c.

<sup>5</sup> Beginning with the Headlam-Knox edition, his share in which is rather obscured in this book.

wry smile when he sees that the supplement suggested on p. 183 involves an estimate of the gap practically identical with that for which his knuckles are rapped on p. 152.<sup>1</sup> Whether conjectural supplements should take their place in an author's text is of course a matter of opinion. Most readers of the Loeb Library will regret, I think, that more of Mr. Knox's are not given opposite the translation here—and later in the book—as so many of them fully deserve to be. Among the solutions of *cruxes* particularly good are those of VI. 65 ff.,<sup>2</sup> VII. 8, 25, 69 (p. 355), 96.

On the other hand, the editor might consider the following notes: I. 41 *αὐτίς* is weak; read *γάμον*?—44 *φιλεῖ τόδε* calls for *γίγνεσθαι*, not *εἶναι*.—Both on p. 90 and on p. 354 the traces at the end of 82 are ignored.—II. 5 *ἐγώ* having intervened, the new subject should be expressed; which favours [*γ' ὁ π*] *ημήνας*.—7 *ἦν* with subjunctive is ungrammatical with the meaning required; it should be *εἰ* with indicative.—III. 82 *οὐκέτ' οὐχί* <*τι*> *πρήξω* is hardly Greek; read one of Headlam's alternatives, *οὐκέτ'*, *οὐκέτι*.—90 *δήκον* could hardly stand first.—IV. 75 *οἱ ἐπὶ νοῦν γένοιντο* *καὶ θεῶν ψαύειν ἠπειγέτο* gives the required meaning only if we ignore *καί* (with the editor's translation); 'what even' is not the same as 'whatever'.—V. 6 The position of *μοι* before *βοῦλει* is not justified by Hippon. 45.—30 I still doubt<sup>3</sup> whether the *χ* is not really *κ*, which, presuming superscript correction of *κη* or *κρη* to *κυη* (*i.e.* *κυῆ*), gives excellent sense without assuming loss of a line.—68 and Intr. xxiii It is unlikely that Herodas mispunctuated in his Proverb Collection (if he used one) *κατὰ μύος· ὄλεθρον*, for it would have to be *ὄλεθρος*, whereas the extant versions of the proverb give the accusative; read *κατάμνος* 'gagged'; cf. *μῦν* in III. 85 and such compounds as *κάθαλος* 'soaked in brine,' *κατάγυνος* 'given to women'.—VII. 54 After *δι* (*i.e.* *δεῖ*) there is not room for *γ* as well as *κ*.—85

*φύλασσε* *κά[ργ]ας* *αὐτά* won't do, for they are made already; read *φ. κά[ργ]α σ<α> αὐτά*, 'keep them very safe'?—91 If this Hecate, with the change of accent, is the Goddess, a note is required in the translation.—106 The unique *ἦ* for *ἔστω* cannot be supported by the almost equally rare use of *μάθης* for *μάθε*; in constructions of exhortation or command the person makes all the difference.—129 *θάλπους ἄνευ* 'sans haste' needs a parallel.

The treatment of the mutilated passages of VIII. shows a great improvement on the editor's earlier work, good, in some respects, as that was; the spaces are more carefully measured and the traces more accurately accounted for. But having changed his mind so often,<sup>4</sup> Mr. Knox would doubtless be the last to claim finality for all his latest supplements—he would put more of them in the text if he did. He might reconsider his views in the following passages: 21 *δεσμά χλ[ωριῶντα]* 'vine-shoots' cannot be right in winter, even in a dream.—22 Mr. Milne kindly writes: 'I don't believe either in [your] *εν* or in [Knox's] *αιξ*;<sup>5</sup> it might be *η*, but there is no certainty'.—25 'Against the altar and hard by me' is unworthy of Herodas.—27 Text rightly (*αν*) *μα*; why (*ε*) *μα* in note?—38 If *οἱ δέ* is rightly restored above, the subject of *ἔφη* should be expressed.—62 Without *ἐκόν* or the like, *θανεῖμαι* means 'I shall die,' not 'I will die'.—67 *ὥς καλὸν* is surely too short.—71 I am still not convinced that *πολλοὶ ἐν Μούσῃσιν* can stand for 'many in a literary line' (*lit.* in the Muses); surely you need *τῶν*.—76 The first *ἦ* is too late.—77 With *μεθ'* 'Ἰππώνακτα so near I do not feel satisfied that the *γνώμη* is not rather the verdict of the critics than the 'intendiment' of the poet. To the suggestions given *en passant* above<sup>7</sup> I would add at I. 17 *ἦβα*] *δέ*, at II. 19 *νῶϊν μέσον* (written without *ι* and rather

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also *Phil. Woch.* 1926. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Though some may prefer a comma after *ἐργάτης*, 'But as to what works he is master of,' etc.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *C.Q.* 1925. 136; Herzog's *ἔχεις* is not in the Papyrus.

<sup>4</sup> *Soph. Phil.* 300 was unparalleled (except for an Elean inscription) till a recent 'new find.'

<sup>5</sup> And small blame to him, having published; would that all scholars found their dead selves such handy stepping-stones! Cf. *C.R.* 1925. 13 and Headlam-Knox text and addenda.

<sup>6</sup> Read also by Herzog.

<sup>7</sup> And in *C.Q.*, *l.c.*

small as init. II. 2); and at VI. 41 *περίαλλα* (*ὑπερβολικῶς* Sch. Soph. O.T. 1218; *λαλεῖσα* needs qualification in this context).

On p. 184 we read, in support of a view of the special aim of VIII.: 'Resolved feet [in this Mime] are rare (only one, except in the first foot); and there are no verses ending in four long syllables.' Now as this concerns the restoration of many mutilated lines, and so affects Professor Herzog's work as well as my own, I must point out that the second of these statements is misleading and the first incorrect. Though it is true that there are no spondaic fifth-feet extant, it is unsafe to presume that they were entirely absent from the unmutilated poem. As we have it, the longest passage of it which for this purpose may be reckoned unmutilated is at the beginning, and has 21 ll., which are separated from the next series of 6 complete ll. by 7 mutilated. There follow three complete-line passages of 6, 8, and 3 ll. separated by two single mutilated ll. Then come 12 mutilated or lost, 1 complete, and 4 mutilated; and then 15 complete ll. finish the poem, making 79 ll. in all. In Mimes I.-VII., which vary in length between 85 and 129 ll., the longest passages without a spondaic fifth-foot are of 31, 37, 57, 29, 24, 42, and 33 ll. respectively—all longer than the longest complete passage of VIII.—and the average frequency is one spondaic fifth-foot in 19 ll. To take the resolved feet, Mime VIII. has one at ll. 14, 16 (?), 30, and 71, and none, except the last, is in the first foot; in fact, they are not so rare in VIII. as in III., which has only 3 in 97 ll., whereas VIII. has 3 (probably 4) in 79 ll. many of which are mutilated or lost.

To correct minor errors: *passim* read Groeneboom, p. 74. l. 13 read 1892, I. 34 *οἶαι*, 63 *προσβλέψαν*, IV. 38 another for the other, V. 4 I? for I., 85 n. In Honey was not offered to the dead delete not, VI. 55 add note II(υλ)αιθῆς P, 48 read What Kerdon?, 83 'by rubbing day and night she hath worn,' etc., VIII. 17 *κεῖκερως*, 25 n. *βωμῶ*,<sup>1</sup>

32 n. *εστικτο* superscr. *επ*, not vice versa, 58 *δεινὰ*, 78 n. *τι*,—and 29 n. after *εστικτῆς* ex v. l. in v. 32 certum: improbat Edmondsius add (to be quite fair) et egomet olim.

The style of the translation, which is remarkably close to the Greek without being un-English, is nevertheless unsatisfying. It protests too much. In his apparent desire to make his translation seem to the English reader what he thinks the original must have seemed to the ancient audience—and there is much to be said for this—Mr. Knox has gone the way of most realists and obscured reality under inessentials. The second-rate novelist makes all his homelier characters drop every single aitch. Similarly here every *if* is *an* and every *more* is *moe*. But this is not all. We may pass *slombried*, *croakles*, and *bashings*, with an indulgent smile—for it is a really good translation—but we resent the apparent pedantry of *note* (will not), *ocillades* (*oeillades*? looks), *enaunter* (?), *forswat* (?), *attone* (?), *welke* (?), because we cannot understand them without the Greek. If Mr. Knox's public is to take the place, in the English, of Herodas' public in the Greek, everything depends on how much learning Herodas' public could stand. If the wife of Theocritus' friend Nicias could understand *The Distaff*, they could probably stand a good deal. But in any case, as the subjects of the *Mimes* imply as a whole the popular rather than the learned appeal, it is unlikely that Herodas' display of learning went beyond what was intelligible to the ordinary man of education, and the more so because in the days of public recitations of poetry immediate clarity was more important than it is now; for when he is listening a man has no time to puzzle a thing out.

With CERCIDAS and the rest of the book, excepting ll. 1-67 of the *Cercidea*, this reviewer can deal only as an outsider, not having studied the Papyri or other original sources. In Cercidas Mr. Knox's excellent work on the metre and the placing of the fragments has not only much improved the text but made it more readable; and the metrically imitative translation, here free from cloying archaisms, is extra-

<sup>1</sup> Three out of four of these misaccentuations are legacies from the Headlam-Knox edition.

ordinarily successful in suggesting the unique flavour of the Cynic's Greek. Occasionally, however, it is difficult to fit the English to the original (where, e.g., is the ὥπασας of V. 12?); and the rendering is not always easily intelligible (e.g. near the top of p. 199). On p. 207 some reference is needed to the scholia overleaf. In the text some particularly good things are: II. 24 ὄπας, from Hesychius, III. fin. the placing of Stob. Fl. 58. 10, and Fr. 2 p. 218 'restorations.' At II. 4 read Turned, 33 ὄν, 47 Fair-dealing, IV. 2 ere his orbs, VI. 9 Σφαίρω. The text of the CERCIDEA is a rather less successful venture, though the editor's second thoughts are generally better than his first. Line 3, I think, ends with ἀνθρώποις;<sup>1</sup> at 7 the supplement is too short, at 20 too long (read κῆξω φόρει, cf. Dem. F.L. 255), at 1 probably too long; at 39 αὐτ is too far off to make εἶναι a probable filling. The beginnings of ll. 45-8 I read as οκου[, μοιρ[, αἰρ[, and ετ[ or ευ[, that of 64 as βη[; and I doubt the editor's reading of 6. At 13 the London Papyrus must, I think, have had ἔχων for Bodl. σώζων. The editor translates his old readings at 69 and 86, and a different punctuation at 72-3; there is something wrong at 87: at 88 νῦν will hardly do (τὼς? but γαστρός is strangely placed).

The fragments of PHOENIX and the Ἀνωνύμου Ἐπιτύμβιος are translated into rhyming couplets reminiscent of Conington's Horace, and almost as good. The only fault I find in these renderings is that they sometimes appear to translate a different (? earlier) reading of the text. At fr. 3. 3 φρονεῖν to suit the translation should be ροφεῖν (Mr. Knox may be glad to know of

Theogn. 827, where ροφέοντας has become φορέοντας); at I. 23 Meineke's πελλή deserved mention; at 2. 14 I do not understand τρώφειν; at 17 πλεῖνα τωνγεω is hardly improved as π. τεττίγων, for the cricket was the proverbial sweet singer, whereas garrulosity (πλεῖνα) belonged to the swallow (the translation 'blithely' makes him neither sweet nor garrulous; read with Rossbach and Mr. Powell πλεῖνα τῶν Γύγεω, 'I am lavish with my song, whether or no you be lavish with your gifts'). The text of 3 and 4 (p. 256) has evidently been very carefully worked over, but in that of 4 Mr. Knox seems to have been unwilling, for once, to adapt his restorations to his later knowledge; e.g. at 3 the text has (συ) and the proposed supplement τυ; at 10 εἶναι, which in most contemporary hands would, I think, be about equivalent in length to 4 full-sized letters, is suggested for a space indicated as containing 6. This is a pity; for the value of these restorations turns on their accounting for all the graphical facts.

The remainder of the book includes what appears to be a very thorough sweeping together of all the choliambic crumbs, with a careful text and a tasteful translation, the former marred, alas! by a note on p. 260 which is aimed, it would seem, at Meineke, Bergk, Kaibel, Haupt, and—ὁ μακάριος τῆς δυστυχίας—Mr. Powell<sup>2</sup>: 'ἀστέων: Casaubon's certain correction (quam nemo unquam dubitavit literarum Graecarum vel minime peritus).'

And yet—this is one of the best works of pure scholarship published for many years.

J. M. EDMONDS.

Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> This reviewer 'restored' ll. 1-8 in *Cambridge Review*, 1926. 327.

<sup>2</sup> *Collectanea Alexandrina*, p. 235.

#### SELECT GREEK INSCRIPTIONS.

*Inscriptiones Graecae ad inlustrandas dialectos selectae.* Edd. F. SOLMSEN—E. FRAENKEL. Fourth edition. Pp. 113. Leipzig: Teubner. 4 Rm. (bound, 4.80).

It is much more widely recognised nowadays than it used to be that the

study of the non-literary Greek dialects as found in the inscriptions is of very great importance for the general study of Greek language and literature. The recent revised edition of Buck's *Greek Dialects* is an excellent book, but it is unfortunately far too expensive for the



ordinary student, and one is therefore delighted to welcome the fourth edition of Solmsen's *Inscriptiones Graecae*. This new edition is the work of Ernst Fraenkel of Kiel, who has not only thoroughly revised and corrected the previous edition, but has also added a considerable amount of new matter. Most important by far of these additions is the recently discovered inscription entitled the 'Lex Sacra Cyrenaica,' which brings a considerable and very welcome increase to our material for the study of Southern Doric. The other inscriptions which have been added to this edition are already to be found in Buck's book, as are also practically all the others, so that if Buck's *Greek Dialects* were available in an accessible library, Fraenkel's Solmsen could be warmly recommended as a very cheap and excellent class-book which could be used in conjunction with Buck. To the inscriptions found in the third edition

Fraenkel has added two Arcadian—namely, the well-known 'Iudicium Mantineense' and that dealing with 'the marking of the boundaries of Orchomenus'; also the decree of Tanagra about the temple of Ceres and the 'decretum de locandis publicis pratis,' two Boeotian inscriptions which are omitted by Buck; also three Argolic, one Locrian and two Phocian, all of which are in Buck. Fraenkel has brought the text thoroughly up to date, and he has prefixed to each inscription a full and excellent bibliography. He has also provided some very good footnotes dealing with variant readings and linguistic difficulties and giving citations of the various solutions that have been propounded. The book is beautifully printed, is very cheap even in its bound form, and cannot be too strongly recommended.

P. S. NOBLE.

University of Leeds.

#### SOME LIGHT ON THE *ECLOGUES* AT LAST.

LÉON HERRMANN: *Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile*. Pp. 194. (Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles. Tome I.) Brussels: 'La Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles,' 1930. Paper.

H. JEANMAIRE: *Le Messianisme de Virgile*. Pp. 216. Paris: J. Vrin, 1930. Paper, 25 fr.

JÉRÔME CARCOPINO: *Virgile et le Mystère de la IV<sup>e</sup> Églogue*. Pp. 220. Paris: 'L'Artisan du Livre,' 1930. Paper, 15 fr.

PROFESSOR HERRMANN of Brussels has made an important contribution to our understanding of the *Eclogues*, although the quality of his work varies and is defaced by a certain blindness to the greatest qualities of Vergil's poetry—a defect which will give offence to all serious students. His lapses seem to be due to a desire to be startling, combined with the Gallic habit of confusing enlightenment with cynicism. Thus, on p. 38, we learn that 'morality has nothing to do with questions of fact,' as if moral facts were not among the most important; and further (p. 48), that

'Vergil's morality cannot have been ("n'a pas dû être") superior to that of his surroundings.' On p. 24 we learn that Vergil 'found it easy to play the flatterer,' and that without that quality he would not have attained to the wealth 'which he must all his life have set his heart on acquiring' ('Virgile a dû avoir toute sa vie ce souci pour laisser une fortune aussi rondelette'). Further (p. 36), that Vergil's ideal poet had 'no pity for misery,' for Professor Herrmann has not escaped an old mistake in the interpretation of *Georg.* II. 499. Not content with representing Vergil as a hard-hearted and avaricious sycophant, Professor Herrmann holds (p. 24) that he was most probably a decadent in the worst sense of the word ('le poète a peut-être été, somme toute, un adolescent pervers'); and this merely because at the beginning of *Eclogue III.* Vergil reproduces from Theocritus a few lines of shepherd's banter, which has about as much relation to facts as the repartees of a London busman or the epithets of a bargee. After this it is not surprising to find (p. 130) a string of unconvincing objec-



tions to the discovery of Skutsch, accepted by Mackail and others, the authorship of the *Ciris*.<sup>1</sup>

There is more to be said for his support, by an ingenious readjustment of dates, though it is hardly convincing, of Professor Slater's view of *Eclogue IV.* as referring to the birth of Marcellus.

The reader will then be warned that Professor Herrmann is capable of strange weaknesses of judgment, and that his statements must be examined with care. Nevertheless, it is clear that he has made a profound study of the *Eclogues* and of the minor poetry of the period, although he does not appear to have read quite all the books that he enumerates in his valuable bibliography; and that he has made a strong case for the principle which with courage he sets out to establish, and which contradicts the view of the ancient commentators which has been generally followed in modern times. Professor Herrmann's canon is that the same name denotes the same person in every one of the *Eclogues* in which it occurs; and that the same person is never denoted by more than one name. Thus we know from Quintilian's statement that Menalcas represents Vergil in *Eclogue IX.*; and we know from his own statement in the Fifth that Menalcas represents him there too—at least, if Vergil was the author of *Eclogue II.* and *III.*, as he certainly was. Professor Herrmann concludes with absolute justice that in *Eclogue III.* also Menalcas must represent Vergil.

It must, I think, be admitted that by cumulative evidence he establishes the second half of his canon, that no real person is called by more than one name. It follows that in *Eclogue I.* Tityrus is not Vergil; and we are at last relieved from the nightmare figures of Amaryllis

<sup>1</sup> The arguments for attributing this poem to Gallus, but for believing at the same time that Vergil had contributed a line or two here and there to the early work of his school-friend, seem to me still irresistible, and to have been confirmed by the laborious but futile criticism of Leo (*Hermes* 37, 1902, p. 14), which, as an eminent Dutch scholar remarked, proves something quite different from what Leo supposed.

and Galatea (as persons connected with Vergil), and of Vergil himself as a slave who had just secured his freedom. If for nothing else, students of the *Eclogues* owe Professor Herrmann hearty thanks for this. He makes a strong case for thinking that Tityrus represents Q. Caecilius Epirota, who was in fact a literary slave of Atticus and of whom we know a good deal, among other things that he obtained his freedom late in life.<sup>2</sup> Iollas seems to represent Maecenas quite clearly.

Now seeing that there are no less than thirty-seven characters in the *Eclogues*, it is a bold thing to try to identify them all, and Professor Herrmann, in his concluding paragraph, is frank enough to claim only that some of his solutions are very probable and others possible. For example, the evidence for the identification of Lycidas with Horace is quite shadowy; so is that for identifying Amaryllis with Plotia Heria; and he hardly attempts to name any of the other ladies except Lycoris, whose identity with Volumnia (Cytheris) has never been a secret. On the other hand, the identification of Daphnis with Catullus seems to me, in the light of the many interesting arguments which he sets forth, to be almost certain, in spite of my previous acceptance of Professor Drew's attractive pleas in favour of Julius Caesar. Daphnis cannot be Caesar if Daphnis is the same person in the Ninth as in the Fifth *Eclogue*, for in the ninth he is called upon to admire Caesar's comet, and Professor Herrmann has convinced me that it is wrong to attribute more than

<sup>2</sup> It is strange that in describing Epirota and quoting Suetonius, *Gramm.* 16, twice, Professor Herrmann—so far as I can find—suppresses the fact, given by Suetonius, that he was banished by Augustus because of his connexion with the daughter of Atticus who was the first wife of Agrippa—except so far as to mention that he was her teacher. Possibly Professor Herrmann considered that these details were irrelevant to his immediate point. Perhaps; but they are relevant to our knowledge of the man and to the history of the time and ought not to have been omitted. I must add my complete dissent from Professor Herrmann's unsupported reference of the *Eclogue* to 49 B.C., and his hypothesis of large but unrecorded confiscations of property in that year. I see no reason to doubt that the *Eclogue* belongs to the period after Philippi.

one personality to any one name. If readers of Professor Herrmann generally are equally convinced of this, he will have rendered a service to Latin scholarship for which his name will long be remembered.

Despite grave faults in scholarship, and a quite impossible view of Vergil's relation to the historical movements of his time, M. Jeanmaire's *causerie*, as he calls it, deserves to be welcomed for its earnestness, modesty, and excellent judgment in purely literary questions. Lovers of Vergil, however little they may be convinced by its arguments as a whole, will read it with pleasure, because of the good taste and sympathy with which Vergil's poetry is interpreted. Stated briefly, the theory of the book is that the child expected in the Fourth *Eclogue* was one of the offspring of Antony and Cleopatra, who were to be regarded as Bacchus and Isis, united in a mystical union to produce a Messiah; that the *Virgo* is nothing better or worse than Isis and Cleopatra, neither of whom would have welcomed the description; that Apollo is only another title for Bacchus (p. 59); that the hero who is to restore peace to the world, and who is to be taken as the type of all the virtues, was the ruffian Mark Antony; and that when Vergil refers in *Aen.* VI. 792-4 to his earlier prophecy, he was making a political recantation, and making it dishonestly, by pretending that the *Eclogue* had welcomed a child of Augustus, not of Antony! The happiness of the new world which the *Eclogue* foretells, M. Jeanmaire describes as containing 'toutes les séductions d'un paradis dionysiaque' (p. 58), because he is able to represent the ivy,<sup>1</sup> and foxglove, and

water-lilies, and acanthus as being connected either with Bacchus or with Egypt; though for the foxglove he has nothing better to offer than its name, *baccar*,<sup>2</sup> which, in French, he spells *bacchar*.

In defiance of the order of the *Eclogues*, we are to believe that the Fourth was written before Vergil's expulsion from his farm, and while he was 'a young provincial' (p. 55) 'with only a mediocre knowledge of politics,' and (p. 43) 'probably badly informed'; and yet on the same page (43) it is argued that Vergil knew that Antony and Octavian had decided in 43 B.C. to make Pollio consul in 40. Most amazing of all is the contention (p. 45) that the great event which led Vergil to write the *Eclogue* was not what scholars have universally assumed, the peace of Brundisium, but the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra, attired as Venus, on her barge at Tarsus in the autumn of 41, an event regarded by Vergil and every other Roman as a national disgrace—*nefas! Aegyptia coniunx* (*Aen.* VIII. 688). And we are calmly asked to believe that if Antony had been victorious at the Battle of Actium the *Aeneid* would have been devoted to celebrating the incarnation and exploits of Bacchus (p. 32).

It is perhaps unfair to make M. Jeanmaire individually responsible for defects in scholarship which are unhappily common in all French printed work, save that of one or two scholars of the highest distinction. Spellings like *irrita*, *tentare*, *aggreior*, *coelites*, *laevis* ('smooth') have been abandoned by competent scholars for half a century. The same perhaps should be said of the

<sup>1</sup> These flowers, however, are not, as M. Jeanmaire states (p. 29), the blossoms which appear on the cradle, only those borne by the earth for the child's playthings. Anyone who has seen a baby playing with a springy shoot of some creeping plant, or with the big petals of a foxglove or snapdragon, will need no recondite explanation of Vergil's choice of these common Italian plants, which he combines, after his regular fashion, with others typical of Egypt and Greece. For no one will persuade me that the *videns acanthus* has anything but its ordinary meaning of the glossy-leaved Greek shrub familiar to us in Corinthian capitals. The epithet must refer to the brightness of the

leaf, not to the 'flexibility' of the stem of some species of gummy acacia (p. 188). The evergreen acanthus mentioned in *Georg.* II. 119 is no doubt a different tree, and possibly the bent acanthus of IV. 123. (The reference to IV. 137 seems to be based on a misreading.) In *Eclogue* III. 45, the reference must be to the plant which Greek sculptors loved to imitate.

<sup>2</sup> It may be pointed out that the word *baccar* belongs to the class of substantives in *-ar*, like *calcar*, *alvear*, which are all the words of country farmers, and it means 'the plant with big buds' (*bacca*, *bacca*), an excellent name for the foxglove, which, even in full bloom, has always some buds at the summit still unopened.

quite appalling attempt to print a passage of Greek on pp. 82 and 83, with twenty-eight blunders in seventeen lines, of which the spelling ζῆν with an iota, for which English school-boys were reprov'd fifty years ago, is the least. But it is difficult to believe that the author is able to scan iambic lines which he prints thus: 'adulteretur et colomba milvo,' and 'refert tenta grex amicus ubera.' Further, he prints the adjective in the phrase *levis hircus* in italics as showing a close resemblance to the adjective in *leves cervi* (*Ecl.* I. 59), though he strangely prints the latter *levis* as if it were an accusative plural. Had he even retained in Horace's line the mis-spelling *laevis* (which he adopts on p. 205), it might have saved him from a worse blunder. (I must not enter into the difficult question of the priority of the *Epode* to the *Eclogue*, or, as M. Jeanmaire plausibly contends, of the *Eclogue* to the *Epode*.) Some of these weaknesses in scholarship have misled the author's own judgment. It is a critical point in his case that the event on which he believes the *Eclogue* to be founded, which he calls 'the Epiphany of 41 B.C.'—to wit, the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra at Tarsus—had already happened, and he finds evidence for this in the word *demittitur*, which he translates 'est descendue,' for which the Latin would be *demissa est*. And it is hardly less than a serious fault that he does not realise that the word *scelus* is constantly used to refer to the wickedness of the Civil Wars (e.g. *Hor. Epode* vii. 1), or that he is content to translate *perpetua* (*formido*) merely by *vieille*; in fact, it refers to the whole terrible century from 133 B.C. onwards.

Notwithstanding all this, those who read this book will look with pleasure for M. Jeanmaire's next publication, which, like the present, is sure to be full of interesting ideas, expressed in charming form, such as his comparison of ll. 54-62 of Horace's *Epode* XVI. with (?) Poseidonius' account of the Canary Islands in *Plut. Sert.* 8. But it is not too much to ask that before he writes further about the Vergilian age he should read through Cicero's *Philippics*, and Appian's story of the proscrip-

tion of 43, and make himself competent to print a page of Greek correctly. He might even condescend to read English, and learn from Warde Fowler and Tenney Frank that Vergil dedicated the *Culex* to Octavius in 48 B.C.

Professor Carcopino's essay makes little claim to originality, though it gives useful means of reference to earlier writers—always provided they did not write in English. He acknowledges in particular his debt to the edition of M. Goelzer, and to Kromayer's article in *Hermes* XXIX., 1894, p. 556. His Latin spelling is better than M. Jeanmaire's, but he is not less incapable of scanning and printing Greek (p. 25, n. 2; p. 102, n. 2; p. 103, n. 2). He has rendered one substantial service to our knowledge of the date of the *Eclogue* by reviving, as he frankly points out, and amplifying, the view of Groebe in *Pauly-Wissowa* (II. 1562), who observed that Pollio's consulship did not begin until after the peace of Brundisium, which, by a careful combination of different evidence, Ettore Pais has shown to have been signed in the first week of October, in 40 B.C. His consulship lasted, as Dio tells us (XLVIII. 32. 1), till within a few days of the end of that year (and it is better to follow Dio than the combinations of Kromayer). The *Eclogue*, therefore, was written somewhere between the middle of October, when Pollio's consulship became a fact, and the last days of December. This date, I may point out, is excellently suited to accord with the birth of Scribonia's child Julia (after *decem menses*) in January, 39 B.C. But, alas, Professor Carcopino has chosen to follow the ancient misunderstanding by which Pollio is taken for the father of the child, when Vergil only calls him the consul of the year in which the child is to be born.

This I cannot describe better than in the words of M. Jeanmaire: 'le monstre littéraire que serait une pièce de 63 vers adressée à un père à l'occasion de sa paternité et où pas un mot n'éveille l'idée de cette paternité.' If anything could render the theory more ludicrous than it is, it would be the excuse offered by Professor Carcopino (p. 186), that Pollio was engaged by his

duties in Dalmatia, and so 'n'a pas assisté à la naissance de son garçon.' Persons who think thus may be tolerable as archaeologists; but when they have not in many years begun to realise that to Vergil the greatest thing in life was the relation between parent and

child, they must be respectfully counselled not to waste any more good paper in attempting to interpret a poet who belongs to a universe which they will never enter.

R. S. CONWAY.

*St. Albans.*

### REPETITA.

*Repetita: An unwilling Restatement of Views on the Subject of the Roman Municipalities.* By W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. Pp. 32. Cambridge: University Press. 1930. Paper, 2s. net.

FEELING that his views on the subject of the Roman municipalities have not been properly understood, Mr. Heitland very reluctantly restates his case. In doing so, he has taken into account observations communicated to him, but they have not led him to alter his views to any serious extent. The restatement may be summarised as nearly as possible in his own words. The point in question, he says, is the practical working of the municipal constitutions, and how far, if at all, the course of the Imperial history was affected thereby. He sees in the steady decay of vitality in the municipal units not merely (with Liebenam) a symptom, but a cause (though not the prime cause) of the Decline and Fall. The municipal system was, he holds, a piece of political machinery that had outlived its usefulness: it was the principal means employed by Rome to incorporate and amalgamate her subject peoples, but it was ill calculated to serve its purpose, for it was isolative, whereas the need now was to animate the vast mass, to invigorate the parts, and combine them in a whole self-conscious and co-operative—in short, to produce an organic union. Further, the normal constitution of the municipalities was very liable to breed abuses, which had to be checked by Imperial ordinances. Cities founded or remodelled on Roman lines were ideal centres for the local growth of the very evils that had marred the career of Rome. The ruling class of wealthier burghesses tended to administer city

affairs in their personal interest, in accordance with Roman precedent. If they spent money freely in benefactions to their cities, they surely looked for some appreciable return; and what could this be but a recognition of their claims to profitable power?

The result was that the municipal system proved itself a source of weakness in the Roman Empire. The municipal structure was not a federal union; the Empire never made a Nation, its agglomeration being mechanical, effected and assured by force. There was no vital union of willing constituent members, and consequently no human impulse driving a city to combine with its neighbours in mutual accommodation and concessions for the common good of the great whole. On the contrary, local rivalries and jealousies prevented the hearty co-operation which the condition of the Empire demanded. The main defect, then, of the municipal system was not that this or that city was a rotten unit, but that the normal city, however splendid, was imperially a stagnant unit, lacking the vital energy to be more than a passive sharer in the Empire's fate. The ancient panegyrics on Rome supply no trustworthy evidence of inner soundness in the Empire; however sincere, they show only that in certain circles the conditions created by the Empire were most acceptable.

Such are the main points of Mr. Heitland's argument. He may rest assured that he has made his position abundantly clear, and has left no excuse for misunderstanding the precise nature of his views. On the main question at issue readers will form their own judgment.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

*Oxford.*



## ROMAN AQUILEIA.

*Aquileia Romana.* Ricerche di Storia e di Epigrafia. By A. CALDERINI. Pp. cxxxvi + 594. Milan: Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero,' 1930. Paper, 75 lire.

THOUGH references to Aquileia among ancient writers are rare, they suffice to prove that from the age of Augustus down to its destruction by Attila this city was among the most important in the Roman Empire. Standing in the principal gateway between Italy and the Danube countries, it was frequently visited by emperors, it was the chief point of departure for traders in the Middle Danube regions, and in connexion with this commerce it developed considerable industry.

Professor Calderini has collected the materials for a history of Aquileia with truly exemplary zeal. Not only has he mustered all the texts and material objects which throw light upon the life of Aquileia, but he has drawn up a full prosopography of its inhabitants, and has introduced his book with a critical bibliography which almost constitutes a book in itself. Yet, in spite of his monumental industry, he warns us repeatedly that he is not writing the history of Aquileia, but is merely paving the way for such a work. He insists on the need of further excavation, reminding us that Aquileia is almost a virgin site.

Among the deficiencies in the evidence set before us in this volume, the lack of objects to illustrate the Italic immigration in the Bronze Age is probably irremediable, for previous to the date of the first Roman settlement its site was an unreclaimed morass. On the other hand, the present paucity of information concerning the municipal government of Aquileia and the life of its seafaring population may at any time yield to abundance, if systematic search is made for inscriptions. Even now the materials for the history of Aquileia are well worth study, for they illus-

trate at many points the conditions of life in the larger cities of the Roman Empire. The following facts, out of many similar items collected by Professor Calderini, may be quoted by way of example. The chief object of worship at Aquileia was a local deity named Belenus, a god of health-giving waters who became the city's 'patron saint.' The worship of Augustus is frequently merged with that of Belenus and other local favourites. The primary objects of export from Aquileia to the Danube lands were the local wine and oil. But the city also developed a flourishing industry in art objects (notably in glassware foreboding the future triumphs of Murano). The population of Aquileia, as might be expected in such a traffic-centre, consisted largely of ex-slaves; indeed it is likely that the freed were at least equal in numbers to the free-born. The immigrant element was drawn from the provinces rather than from Italy; the ubiquitous Syrian trader of course established himself there; the medical practitioners and one solitary rhetor were Greeks. These instances may serve to show the many-sided interest of Professor Calderini's book.

The following small points call for correction: When Caesar took up winter quarters at Aquileia, his object was hardly to keep an eye on Rome (for which purpose he used Ravenna). More probably he came to inspect the eastern frontiers of his province, and to consider the chances of warfare on that sector (p. 29). On p. 64 the date 275 A.D. has been misprinted into 175. The author of the article 'Legio' in Pauly-Wissowa, which Professor Calderini quotes in connexion with the military history of Aquileia, is not Kubitschek (who merely wrote the last eight columns), but Ritterling.

M. CARY.

University College,  
London.



## ROMAN SPAIN.

*Imperial Roman Spain: The Objects of Trade.* By LOUIS C. WEST. Pp. iv+92. Oxford: Blackwell, 1929. Boards, 5s. net.

MR. WEST is known already for two meritorious studies in the economic life of the provinces under the Roman Empire—one dealing with Roman Egypt (*J.R.S.* VII., 1917, pp. 45 ff.), the other entitled 'Commercial Syria under the Roman Empire' (*Trans. of the Amer. Phil. Association*, LV., 1924, pp. 159 ff.), and this brochure of some ninety pages has been planned upon the same principles as his two previous articles, and is a worthy successor to them. A brief introduction discusses the means of communication and transport, and the succeeding sections describe the economic value of the Spanish provinces under such headings as 'Agricultural Products,' 'Animals and Animal Products,' 'Mines, Metals, and Mineral Salts,' 'Textiles,' 'Pottery,' concluding with an exhaustive treatment of merchants and trades, Spaniards living abroad, and a full list of imports. Every kind of source has been ransacked for information—Strabo and Pliny, the poets, geographers, inscriptions, pottery and glass; and, thanks to this indefatigable industry, the picture here presented of Spain as an economic unit in the Empire is extremely complete: it is, quite simply, the best and most up-to-

date treatment of the subject which can be found, and will be quite indispensable either for reference or for the future researcher.

In fact, it is so good that a few words, more in sorrow than in anger, must be said about one feature—the presentation of the information, which is poor. There are more misprints than there should be, and the system of references seems haphazard and irritating. No one is going to grumble that Rostovtzeff's masterpiece should appear as *Soc. and Econ. Hist.*, but there is no index of abbreviations at all, and a book is apt to appear under two or three differing titles. And what is the average student, who wants to examine more closely, to do when he finds himself confronted with such references as Davis, *Wealth*, or Idrisi, 192, or Maclaren, *Gold*, or O. R. L. Weissenburg, taf., or Geopon. ix. 26, or the simple names of Loring, Porter, and Pullen, without any indication as to what, when, or how these gentlemen published? With but a little more trouble this small book would have been well-nigh perfect in its class, and it is a pity that this extra trouble was not taken. But, misprints or no, anyone interested in the economics of the Empire will have to buy it.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*St. John's College,  
Cambridge.*

## A GERMAN TRANSLATION OF PLOTINUS.

*Plotinus Schriften übersetzt.* Von RICHARD HARDER. Band I. Pp. xi + 198. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1930. Paper, RM. 12 (bound, 13.50).

THE appearance of the first instalment of this new German translation of the *Enneads* by the editor of *Gnomon* is an event of real importance. To translate Plotinus is an enterprise of quite another order, and of immeasurably greater usefulness, than the production of fresh versions of Plato or Thucydides. 'There are,' observes Professor Harder, 'perhaps twenty or thirty persons alive today who can read this author after a fashion'; and no one familiar with the

present state of Plotinian scholarship is likely to question his estimate, unless on the ground that it is too generous. The idiom of Plotinus obeys its own laws, and these laws can be grasped only by a long personal apprenticeship; for the student has at present no *subsidia*—no commentary worth the name, no proper *index verborum*, not even an adequate *apparatus criticus*. A trustworthy text might seem to be the first need; but Professor Harder argues that before we set about constituting a text we must see how much of it we can translate. He modestly offers us his rendering 'not as a definitive reproduc-

tion of "what is there," but as evidence of a fresh struggle to understand the Greek.' That the struggle has not been fruitless is clear from many passages in the instalment under review. As a translator he has one conspicuous merit in comparison with earlier adventurers in this field: when confronted with a difficult sentence he never tries to save his face either by reproducing the verbal ambiguity of the original (according to the habit of his best-known German predecessor) or by the equally tiresome expedient of loose paraphrase. While not pedantically literal, his version will, I think, prove more useful to students of the original than any other which has yet appeared.

The treatises are arranged in the order of their composition as given by Porphyry, and the present volume includes the whole of the first group, those written before 263 A.D. The version will be completed in five smallish volumes, which are to be followed (one is glad to learn) by five further volumes of critical and explanatory notes. Until these last have been published no final judgment on the translation itself, or on the text which it implies, will be possible. It is clear, however, that a good many so-called emendations, resting on mere misunderstanding or on ignorance of Plotinian usage, which have been thoughtlessly retained by successive editors and translators, have been dismissed by Professor Harder, e.g. Volkmann II. 129. 10; 130. 32; 203. 7; 508. 19. It is arguable that the purgative process might with advantage have been carried still further, e.g. at Volk. I. 225. 21 is the 'received' text, *τοὺς γε σπουδαίους καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τὰ καλὰ πράττειν*, possible Greek for 'die Guten

tun das Gute aus eigenem Wille?' should we not return to the reading of the MSS., *τοὺς γε σπουδαίους πράττειν, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τὰ καλὰ πράττειν*—'the good (alone) are agents (cf. *supra* I. 15), and right action is in their power'? Other passages where the MS. reading ought in the present reviewer's judgment to have been followed are Volk. II. 121. 29 ff., which merely needs repunctuation (cf. 132. 5-11); and II. 150. 5 (where the doctrine is that the intelligible world could not exist without giving rise to the psychic). Space allows only a few further queries:

Volk. I. 87. 23: 'sofern auch die übrige Seele mit urteilt': this nullifies the sense of the preceding clause. *ὅταν καὶ* = *εἰ καὶ ἐνίοτε* 'notwithstanding sometimes,' and *αὐτῇ* in the next line is the faculty of aesthetic judgment?

I. 92. 31: 'Erstrebt wird es sofern es gut ist, und unser Streben richtet sich auf es als auf ein Gutes': the second clause adds nothing to the first. Rather 'Even the desire towards it is to be desired as a good'?

II. 259. 24 f.: 'Man kommt von ihnen aus nicht zum Geist, sondern zur Seele': but how can *ῥύπος* and *πηλός* 'lead to' the Soul? Read *οὐδ' ἐκ τούτων νοῦς, ἀλλ' <ἄλλα> ψυχὴ παρὰ νοῦ λαβοῦσα παρὰ ὕλης ἄλλα* (sc. *λαμβάνει*).

In the present state of our knowledge any translation of the *Enneads* must inevitably contain many such disputable renderings. The important fact is that Professor Harder's enterprise promises to bring the full understanding of Plotinus much nearer than it has ever been before. It is assured of a warm welcome from students of Neoplatonism in this country.

E. R. DODDS.

University of Birmingham.

*Aegyptiaca*. A Catalogue of Egyptian Objects in the Aegean Area. By J. D. S. PENDLEBURY. Pp. xix+121; 5 plates, 3 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 15s.

THIS is a catalogue of all Egyptian objects, of dates down to the end of the twenty-sixth dynasty, found in the Aegean area, except those from Rhodes, which will be included in the report of the Italian excavations at Ialysus. Those who have toiled through inadequate and badly arranged catalogues will welcome this volume,

for Mr. Pendlebury, who is director of the excavations at Tell el Amarna and also curator of Cnossos, is not only an expert in both sides of his subject, but also an artist in arranging it. The objects from each site are grouped separately, and are prefaced by a short account of the site itself; as each group occupies a separate page, there is plenty of space for additions by the reader. The description of the objects is clear and concise, and the date and context of each object are stated, with references to previous publications and similar finds else-

where. In a catalogue there is naturally little room for theorising, and controversial views are rightly suggested rather than forced upon the reader. The appendices contain tables which will be useful to the student of Minoan chronology, as well as a short account of Aegean pottery found in Egypt. The indexes are excellent. The drawings and maps are unusually clear; the photographs are mostly good, though a few of the subjects might have been better reproduced by line drawing. The price is remarkably low considering the excellent production of the book.

C. R. WASON.

*University of Edinburgh.*

*Homer and the Greek Accents.* By Sir GEORGE YOUNG, Bart. Pp. viii + 38. Reading: Poynder and Son, 1930. Buckram, 6s. post free.

THIS little book will be read with interest. Accent and intonation are so integral a part of language, that their exact nature cannot be a matter of indifference to any who study a language, from either the linguistic or the literary point of view. To read or speak English with complete disregard or alteration of its stress and intonation would destroy its character as English; and it is a matter of regret that many classical scholars have paid so little attention to the conditions of accent and intonation which governed the actual pronunciation of Greek and Latin.

Even though some may not follow Sir George Young in all his conclusions, we may be grateful to him for the clear and pleasing way he has enunciated the problem and for the excellent little collection he has made of passages from ancient authors relative to the place and character of the accent in both Greek and Latin. In Part I he establishes, from the evidence of these quotations, the fact that the pitch accent of ancient Greek was gaining, or had already gained, the character of a stress by the beginning of the Christian era. So far we may follow him; but when in Part II he appears to maintain that a stress accent developed dependent upon quantity without regard to the position of the pitch accent (as indicated by the Alexandrians), there will be many who must differ from his conclusions. The weakness of the argument seems to rest in neglect of evidence furnished by comparison (1) with other Indo-European languages, and (2) with Modern Greek. Firstly, the traditional position of the Greek accent agrees in general with that attested by Vedic Sanskrit, Lithuanian, Slavonic and Germanic. Secondly, in Modern Greek it is not the old quantities which have changed the position of the accent, but the old accent which has changed the quantities: *σίδηρος* has become not \**sidēro*, but *sidēro* (with half-long *i* and short *e*); *τεθαμμένος* has become not \**thāmmenos*, but *thamēnos* (with single *m* and half-long *e*).

Sir George Young, a remarkable man, died shortly after the publication of this book in his ninety-third year.

R. L. TURNER.

*Corinth: Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IV., Part I.: Decorated Architectural Terracottas.* By IDA THALLON-HILL and LIDA SHAW KING. Pp. xii + 120: 5 coloured plates and 48 text illustrations. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1929.

THIS valuable work is the first published part of the official account of the excavations so long conducted at Corinth by the American School at Athens. Forty-three pages are devoted to a general discussion of the terracottas, and this is followed by an inventory of some 700 fragments, classified as Antefixes, Ridge-palmettes, Simas, Eaves-tiles, and Miscellaneous. The fragments, which have mostly survived as Roman filling material are of the greatest importance for the history of Doric architecture: the most significant definite conclusion drawn from them is the Corinthian origin of the 'Megarian' type.

*Corinth: Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IV., Part II.: Terracotta Lamps.* By OSCAR BRONEER. Pp. xx + 339; 210 text figures and xxxiii plates. Publishers as above, 1930. \$5.0.

THIS work, the second part of the official Corinth publication to see the light, is a very valuable contribution to archaeological research. Terracotta lamps, being common objects of domestic use, are extremely useful for the dating of more important monuments. Their study, especially for the Greek period, has been much neglected, and the elaborate classification here propounded is pioneer work of great importance. The author has performed his task with care and skill, and the illustrations are ample and excellent. It is impossible to discuss his arguments here in detail, but it is interesting to note that he is sceptical of the explanation of the *cothon* as a lamp. There is a good bibliography.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

*Theophrastus' Charakter der Deisidaimonia als religionsgeschichtliche Urkunde.* Von HENDRICK BOLKESTEIN. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, XXI. 2.) Pp. 81. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1929. Paper, M. 6.

PROFESSOR BOLKESTEIN provides a most interesting collection of illustrative passages, invaluable for an understanding of the details of the character; in addition they are so arranged as to throw emphasis on a general conclusion, namely that the practices of Theophrastus' *deisidaimon* do not differ in kind from those of the ordinary man of his time; his peculiarity is that he performs them in and out of season. This result is in accord with the facts emphasised in the introduction. Theophrastus is the first author to use *δεισιδαιμον* and its derivatives in a bad sense.<sup>1</sup> Three earlier instances are

<sup>1</sup> Professor Bolkestein does not mention *ἀδεισιδαιμονίη* in 'Hippocrates' *περὶ εὐσχημοσύνης* 5, but perhaps he regards this as later than Theophrastus.

quoted in which the words are equivalent to *θεοσεβής*, κ.τ.λ. Professor Bolkestein illustrates fully the constant interchange in the fifth and fourth centuries of *δαίμων* *δαίμωνιον* on the one hand and *θεός* *θεῖον* on the other. The observation is not new, but worth repeating when it can be disregarded by such an eminent authority as Professor Nilsson; nor is it sufficiently taken into account in the adverse criticism of Professor Immisch (*Gnomon* 6, 270-74), who attempts (unsuccessfully, I think) to maintain his opinion that the *disidaimon* is concerned 'mit dämonischen Wesen.' It is noteworthy that even at a later date, when a distinction between *θεός* and *δαίμων* was much more commonly drawn, *δαισινδαιμονία* is called *ἡ ἐπὶ πλεόν θεραπεῖα τῶν θεῶν* by Strabo and *ἀκαίρος θεοσεβεία* by Appian. Long and important notes are devoted to the words *προσκυνεῖν* and *τελεῖν*. The author shows that there was nothing peculiarly oriental or feminine about falling on the knees as a sign of reverence. When *προσκυνεῖν* denotes a gesture (and has not the weakened meaning 'honour' or 'beseech') it means the same gesture for Greeks and Asiatics. The original meaning of *τελεῖν* he considers to be quite general, 'religious ceremony,' whence by specialisation 'sacrifice' and by further specialisation 'purification-sacrifice,' then on the principle of *pars pro toto* 'mystery.'

The merits of the book are based on a careful accumulation of material—the credit for some of which goes to two pupils of Professor Bolkestein's, Dr. P. J. Koets and another unnamed—and a sane and illuminating judgment, which must bring both pleasure and profit to any reader interested in Greek religion.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Fra Hellas og Italien.* Udvalgte Afhandlingar af J. L. HEIBERG. Two volumes. Pp. xi + 496 and 420. Copenhagen and Oslo: Jespersen og Pio, 1929. Paper.

'Om den græske Matematik, der var Heibergs egentlige Felt, har han aldrig skrevet paa Dansk, om de centrale Dele af Filologien aldrig paa andre Sprog end Dansk, paa en enkelt Undtagelse nær.' That was fortunate for Denmark, but it means that the papers of this eminent scholar that ought to be most widely known will scarcely be read beyond the range of the Scandinavian languages. The best service that I can render them is to give the subjects of what seem to me the chief from our point of view, and to add that the British Museum has a copy of the book:—Greek views of life and death, of love, of hell; 'Mental malady in classical antiquity'; 'Greek rules of health'; 'An outpost of Hellas' (Massalia); Hippocrates; 'The religious outlook of Herodotus'; 'The woman-question in ancient Athens'; 'Freedom of speech in the Old Comedy'; 'The development of Socrates'; 'Religion and ethics, with special reference to the Greeks'; 'Ancient polemics against Christianity'; 'Greek rhetors under the Empire'; studies of Michael Psellos and Georgios

Gemistos Plethon; 'A Renaissance that failed' (Greek under the Normans—Roger Bacon); 'The revival of the study of Greek'; sketches of some Italian towns and monasteries, with photographs; a memoir of Madvig. A list of the author's publications, amounting to 297 items, is appended.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Studien zur griechischen Fabel.* By URBAN URSING. Pp. ix + 111. Lund: Håkan Ohlsson, 1930. Paper.

MR. URSING deals in the main with aspects of the *Sprachgebrauch* of Greek Fable. Many deviations from classical idiom are noted and explained, and illustrated from other late Greek and Byzantine works, and there are some useful lexicographical notes. In addition, attention is called to an unused MS., and an interesting chapter is devoted to the metre of the verse fables.

There are three cardinal rules for accentual verse: (i) a fixed number of syllables in a line; (ii) a caesura; and (iii) certain fixed accents. In the MS. (Ch) which gives the largest number of verse fables these rules are observed without exception. In the others that contain verse fables they are violated so often and so completely that it is beyond plausible emendation to restore the metre, and Mr. Ursing doubts whether many such fables should be printed as verse at all; for, as he justly remarks, it is only by the application of these rules that verse can be distinguished from prose. He would therefore reject all collections of verse fables except Ch's; and in order to preserve the regularity of Ch's metre he is prepared to defend much irregular syntax and to condemn many atticing conjectures.

In his general attitude towards editors' corrections he is undoubtedly right; but although it is certain that scholars' attempts to foist classical idiom on late Greek authors have usually been wrong-headed, Mr. Ursing does at times go too far in the opposite direction. His new MS. (Ci) is closely related to Ca and Ch, two of the best MSS. It differs from Ca considerably and from Ch to a smaller extent in providing more numerous and more striking specimens of bad Greek. Mr. Ursing counts this a merit. Perhaps it is; but there are several occasions when his zeal to believe the worst, whatever the authority, seems misplaced. At 179 b 22 (Chambry) he defends *ἐκ τὰ = ἐξ ὧν* (which is actually given by Ci) on the grounds that Ca, 'an archaising MS.,' in order to avoid *ἐκ τὰ* writes *ὡς γὰρ*. Again, at 156 a 3 and 251 d 15 he favours the scarcely credible perfect infinitive though in the second case *εὐρηκέναι* gives a syllable too much and so breaks one of the cardinal rules. The MS., it is true, is not Ch, but for the rest of the fable the metre is more or less correct.

But Mr. Ursing's fault is on the right side. It is only by recording and comparing the linguistic peculiarities which the MSS. attribute to the various late Greek authors that any con-



ception can be gained of the liberties which were in those times actually taken with grammar and syntax, and this book by virtue of its examples as well as of its argument will be useful to students of late Greek.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Astrologie und Universalgeschichte: Studien und Interpretationen zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis.* Von VIKTOR STEGEMANN. Pp. viii + 257; folding star-map and 2 diagrams in text. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Cloth, RM. 18 (unbound, 16). THIS is Vol. IX. of the late F. Boll's series ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, to which we already owe several good works on ancient astronomical and astrological ideas. Stegemann is something of an enthusiast for that extraordinary work the *Dionysiaka*, to which he seems to the reviewer to attribute more literary worth than it possesses. But there can be no two opinions as to its need of interpretation, and this he is well qualified to furnish. Apart from its positive value, his book ought to have the desirable negative result of warning those who are tempted to see classical ideas in the very curious mythology and religion of Nonnos that the real content of his poem is largely of Asiatic origin.

Three main ideas, according to Stegemann's plausible and well-reasoned interpretation, run through the forty-eight books of this fifth-century epic.<sup>1</sup> The most obvious is an Orphic or Orphic-Dionysiac doctrine of sin and retribution, illustrated, for instance, by the definite association (VI. 206 sqq.) between the murder of Zagreus and the following ἐκτίρωσις. With this is combined, less obviously, the schema of a Hellenistic panegyric, as laid down by Menander the rhetorician. The whole poem is a panegyric in form, with Dionysos in his capacity as a divine prince and saviour for its hero. Finally, and this is the most important feature, the chronology, so to call it, of the entire action follows a doctrine of *saecula*, largely astrological, but with features from outside astrology, the whole being very unlike the traditional Hesiodic ages. Of this the tables (κύβητες) of Harmonia in the twelfth book give a kind of summary. They are an astrological calendar of the world-year, and their contents are given in some detail up to the end of the fourth table, which takes us to the Indian campaign of Dionysos. This was the age of Scorpio; the cosmic year had begun under Leo. The poem indeed does not deal with the ages of Sagittarius and Capricornus, which should follow as the next two cosmic months, nor does it tell in full how the plan of Zeus to restore justice to the world was fulfilled. It does, however, hint at this pretty strongly, not only in its laudatory mentions of the Roman Empire in general, but

especially in the emphasis laid (in Books XL.I. ff.) on Beroe and the founding of her city, Berytus. For Nonnos the Empire has still a great future; it is the earthly instrument of the return of Justice (Astraea-Dike) and the rule of law; hence, with true Nonnian quaintness and lack of proportion, the weighty significance of the famous law-school at Berytus.

Such in brief is this very ingenious interpretation. Lack of space forbids discussion of a number of subsidiary points, such as the numerical proportions of the parts of the poem, the resemblances between Typhon, in the opening books, and Ahriman in the Persian tradition, and much else that is of interest and not seldom controversial. It may be said in general that Stegemann is a follower, not only of Boll, but also of Norden and Reitzenstein.

I have noted but one mistake in fact, the fruit of an unverified reference: P. 160, what Alexander, in Antonius Diogenes, *de incredibilibus ultra Thulen* 12, found in a tomb at Tyre, was not a book of prophecies, but the history of the persons buried there.

H. J. ROSE.

St. Andrews University.

*Bibliothek Warburg: Vorträge 1927-1928.* Pp. ix + 341; 61 illustrations in 41 full-page plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. M. 20 (sewn).

THIS interesting volume is concerned with classical studies only in part, although Greek drama is referred to more or less throughout. The general subject is dramatic performances, written and unwritten, their origins, literary criticism, and relation to ritual and other religious and philosophical activities.

It is unfortunate that, since this is not an anthropological journal, no more than a brief mention can be made of one of the best contributions, the admirable study by the veteran K. T. Preuss (pp. i-88 with plates) of *Der Unterbau des Dramas*, an excellent collection, with good and penetrating analysis, of savage and barbarian performances, ritual and otherwise, of a mimetic nature. It may be noted that he does not mention the late Professor Ridgeway's clever, but too tendentious, essay on similar lines, and that he is doubtful (p. 8) whether our material is sufficient to trace the development of the drama of a civilised people, even the Greeks, from these savage forerunners of tragedy and comedy.

The most definitely classical study is that of J. Geffcken (pp. 89-166), *Der Begriff des Tragischen in der Antike; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Aesthetik*. His intention is to trace the development of what a modern regards as tragic feeling—Goethe's 'irreconcilable opposition,' conflict within and without, the woes of humanity as reflected in the sorrows of an individual—from ancient tragedy, which, especially in its beginnings, was often enough not tragic at all in this sense. In pursuance of this object, he first gives a brief but very suggestive critique of the great tragedians themselves; the reviewer notes with satisfaction that he does not even mention the paradoxical denial of Aeschylus' authorship of the

<sup>1</sup> Stegemann gives (pp. 206-9) good grounds for putting the composition of the poem fairly early in the fifth century, since it is probably earlier than the paraphrase of St. John, which is to be dated some time after the Synod of Ephesos, 431.



*Prometheus*, defends the Euripidean origin of frag. 286, despite the shaky external authority, and recognises the *Rhesos* for what it is, namely late 'Dutzendware.' He passes to a consideration of Plato's and Aristotle's views, his brief remarks on the *Poetics* being particularly good, and then proceeds to trace the influence of tragedy and of tragic sentiment through the later literature of all kinds. He does justice to Seneca, on pp. 158-160, with as much mercy as that writer deserves.

But O. Regenbogen (*Schmerz und Tod in den Tragödien Senecas*, pp. 167-218), not content with this, nor with the influence of Seneca on later drama, discovers great merits in his tragedies, and notably psychological insight and ability to portray strong passion. It is matter of opinion; the reviewer's is exactly opposite to Regenbogen's.

The remaining essays, K. Vossler on *Die Antike und die Bühnendichtung der Romanen*, and Josef Kroll, *Zur Geschichte des Spieles von Christi Höllenfahrt*, deal respectively with mediaeval and post-mediaeval plays and with Oriental and Christian liturgies for the most part. H. J. ROSE.

St. Andrews University.

*Latin Historical Inscriptions illustrating the History of the Early Empire.* (Second edition.) By G. MCN. RUSHFORTH. Pp. xxxii+144. Oxford: University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THIS volume is a photographic replica of the previous edition, from which it differs only by the addition of a few supplementary notes and an up-to-date bibliography. The notes, in the preparation of which the author had the expert assistance of Professor Anderson and of Mr. Last, are admirably clear and compendious. *Honoris causa*, one might pick out the interesting summary of recent discussion on the governorship of Quirinius, and the new information on the administrative and military history of the early Roman Empire. In the bibliography one would have liked to see a reference to Hardy's edition of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, and to Abbott and Johnson's *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*.

M. CARY.

University College, London.

*Schlachten-Atlas zur Antiken Kriegsgeschichte.* By KROMAYER-VEITH. 5th instalment: Greek II, 6 and 7; Roman III, 15-18. Leipzig: H. Wagner and E. Debes, 1929. RM. 8.40.

THIS penultimate instalment of Kromayer-Veith's atlas of ancient battles follows the lines of its predecessors, and the same high standard is maintained. The Greek section deals with the campaigns and battles of Alexander, the Roman section with those of Caesar in Gaul and Britain. The same methods are followed. There are good strategical maps to illustrate campaigns, and a number of tactical maps of the individual battles. There are references to

the original sources and to the modern literature, and the usual short summary of the course of events and of the different views is given. The English sources are fully recognised, especially in the section dealing with Caesar in Britain, in which the views of Rice Holmes are largely accepted. N. WHATLEY.

Clifton College.

*The Roman Law of Marriage.* By P. E. CORBETT. Pp. xii+254. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS is a lawyers' book, and laymen may find it stiff reading; but it should be very useful to anyone who has occasion to look up any particular point in the law of marriage. Professor Corbett does not put forward many new theories; the problems raised by his subject are more of detail than of principle; but he gives a judicious and well-documented account of present-day knowledge and opinion. His chief challenges to orthodoxy are a suggestion that the modern term *matrimonium iuris gentium* is a bad name for a medley of institutions which had little or nothing in common, and a restatement of the view, rejected by Levy, that Augustus' *Lex Iulia de Adulteriis* 'established a compulsory form of *repudium* with seven witnesses.' His arguments on both points are strong if not conclusive. P. W. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*M. Terenti Varronis Rerum Rusticarum Libri Tres.* Post HENRICUM KEIL iterum edidit GEORGIUS GOETZ. Editio nova correctior. Pp. xxiv+162. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. Cloth, RM. 5.60 (unbound, 4.60).

THIS text follows with very little change Goetz's first edition of 1912, which was itself based on Keil's editio minor of 1889. The 1912 text was more conservative than Keil's: the new edition is more conservative still, and the manuscript readings are restored at 1. 58 (*scantianas*), 2. 4. 9 (*generē*), 2. 4. 16 (*deliti*), 2. 7. 15 (*et*), 3. 16. 30 (*primo cum*), 3. 17. 10 (*se*). Goetz rightly rejects Schoerl's attempt to claim for the fifteenth century Vindobonensis 33 an authority independent of the lost Florentinus, and refuses to believe that Crescentius did not use a descendant of the Florentinus, or that his good variants are not due to conjecture. The appendix to the preface takes account of the work of Walter, Kohlschmidt, Mras, and Ahle: only two new conjectures are admitted to the text—*cinguntur* for *tanguntur* at 1. 45. 3 and Goetz's *iterum* for *alterum* at 1. 5. 4. The editor also suggests *greges armentorum* for *maiorum* at 2. 4. 22, and at 3. 3. 9 for the corrupt *mithon* of the manuscripts and (*nebullus ac*) *mintho* of Columella proposes *malthon* from the Philoxenus gloss (*C.G.L.* II. 132, 58) *nebulō*: *μᾶθων*, etc. On p. xxii of the preface the reference to the *J.R.S.* should be 1919, and 'cf. Cato' should be corrected where it occurs.

C. J. FORDYCE.

Jesus College, Oxford.

*Index Verborum quae exhibent Sallustii Epistulae ad Caesarem.* By E. SKARD. Pp. 63. Oslo: Some, 1930.

A GLOSSARY on the lines of Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum*, which might serve to throw light upon the authorship of the Letters, as it provides a ready means of comparing their vocabulary with that of Sallust's historical works. Its consultation is made easy by good print and setting out.

M. CARV.

*Die Augusteische Kultur.* By R. HEINZE. Pp. 157; two plates. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. 6s. Bound, R.M. 6.50 (unbound, 5).

THIS book reproduces in their original presentation a series of addresses delivered by the late Professor Heinze to the German troops at Bucharest in 1918. It was Heinze's intention to elaborate these into a more learned and ample treatise, but he never found time to recast his work as he had proposed. Nevertheless we may be grateful to Professor Körte for publishing the lectures as they were delivered, for in this form they provide an admirable introductory survey to the Augustan age. Heinze's work shows a clear eye for essentials, a keen power of appreciation, and a balance and precision of thought which betray the mature classical student. In addition, the letterpress and get-up of his book are much above the German average.

The only criticism that need be offered here is that Heinze presents Augustus' statesmanship in a somewhat too favourable light. The emperor's settlement of the Parthian question is flattered unduly by the untenable statement that 'the Parthians extended a hand with terrible menace to the coasts of Asia Minor'; the equally mistaken assertion that Augustus possessed no 'ius edicendi' gives an exaggerated idea of his republican moderation. But a slight distortion here is almost laudable, for it helps to throw into relief the essential point which Heinze did well to emphasise—that Augustus was a genuine patriot and (so far as circumstances permitted) a good republican. In the chapters on Augustan literature it will suffice to select for special commendation the brief but incisive description of Roman higher education, the analysis of Vergil's dramatic technique, and the character sketch of Horace, which is perhaps the best thing in the whole book.

An exile among the 'inhospitable Getae' was hardly too high a price to pay for the privilege of hearing Heinze's addresses. His book may be confidently recommended to the English-speaking public.

M. CARV.

University College, London.

*Die Abstammung der Bulgaren und die Urheimat der Slaven.* By DR. GANTSCHO TZENOFF. Pp. xi+358. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1930. Paper, R.M. 22 (bound, 24).

THE author's purpose is to prove that the Bulgarians are the descendants of the Thracians and were in their country before the coming of

the Slavs. He will not allow that the latter flooded the Thracians and in their turn suffered conquest by the Asiatic Bulgars. After reading some fifty pages of his book with increasing disquiet, I came to the section on Scythia, in which it appeared that Scythia included Thrace and came down to the Aegean (just as the Bulgars wish to do), that the Thracian Bosphorus was the Cimmerian, and the Golden Horn the Maeotis, the Caucasus in Illyria and Imaus the same as Haemus. I did not think it was my duty to read further.

E. H. MINNS.

Pembroke College, Cambridge.

*The Youth of Virgil.* By BRUNO NARDI. Translated by BELLE PALMER RAND. Pp. xii+139. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: Milford, 1930. Cloth, \$1.50, or 7s.

*In Quest of Virgil's Birthplace.* By E. K. RAND. Pp. xvii+170; 127 illustrations and 3 maps. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: Milford, 1930. Cloth, \$2.50 or 11s. 6d.

*Vergil.* Von WALTER WILL. Pp. [vi]+148. Munich: C. H. BECK, 1930. Paper, M. 4.50; cloth, M. 6.50.

IT is a pleasure to be able to welcome these three bimillenary books. Professor Nardi's *Giovinezza di Virgilio* well deserved translation into English; he combines a full knowledge of the commentators with an appreciation of Virgil's poetry and an understanding of the nature of evidence, and thus produces no 'Vergilroman,' but a very clear and useful account of the facts and guesses about Virgil's first thirty years. Perhaps the commentators' confused and contradictory stories of the confiscations might have been treated with a more thoroughgoing scepticism. It is greatly to be desired that students of Virgil should approach *Eclogues* I. and IX. with minds unprejudiced by these tales, to discover whether the poems themselves force on the reader the current allegorical interpretations.

An appendix to Professor Nardi's book contains an examination of Professor Conway's claim that Virgil's birthplace lay in the neighbourhood of Calvisano, not of the traditional Pietole. Much the same criticisms are made by Professor Rand in a light-hearted manner suited to the somewhat fantastic dispute. The arguments against Professor Conway are complete, but scattered through an account of a tour from Milan to Riva; even as the boat passes Gargnano we learn that 'Probus' *milvia passuum xxx*, the keystone of the unorthodox theory, is after all only one of two readings. The book is most lavishly illustrated, and would make a delightful gift.

The third book is an attempt to explain to the general public Virgil's thought as a product of his experiences, of the political, social and literary history of his time. Naturally there are details one might dispute, but it is a very competent achievement of a difficult task, the compression of a kind of criticism essential for the

understanding of Latin poetry. The quotations from Virgil are given in the translation of Herr Rudolf Schroeder, who, according to the author, 'has for the first time captured in German words the atmosphere of a Roman work of art.' Others must judge this claim.

*De Didone graeca et latina.* By JERZY KOWALSKI. (Rozprawy wydziału filologicznego, LXIII. 1.) Pp. 49. Cracow: Gebethner and Wolff, 1929.

It is difficult to believe that any evidence relevant to the Dido legends can have escaped the author's attention. The first half of the work suggests how the story may have developed in Greek authors, starting from Ctesias. The writer has a taste for puns, e.g. 'Hercules IV. (i.e. Melquart) filia commemoratur apud Cic. de nat. deor. III. 16, 42 Quartus Iouis et Asteriae, etc.', 'Aen. IV. 383-4 Dido saepe uocaturum, i.e. ni fallor, Διδώ = δειδω', Scharbas suggests to him σοῦ ἡπταξαν and Iarbas *ad barbaros*. In the second half he discusses the sources of Naevius, Cato, and Varro. It is pleasing to find that his analysis goes to confirm the view that Virgil invented the story of Dido's love for Aeneas.

*The Copa.* An Investigation of the Problem of Date and Authorship with Notes on Some Passages of the Poem. By ISRAEL E. DRABKIN. Pp. viii + 106. New York: W. F. Humphrey Press, 1930. Paper.

THIS useful summary and critique of previous writings on the *Copa*, amplified here and there by the author, makes it clear that, while no valid reason has yet been shown for regarding the poem as Augustan or post-Augustan, internal evidence, notably the free use of diminutives, loan-words, present participles, and polysyllabic pentameter-endings, combines to suggest a pre-Augustan date. The facts, emphasised by Drew, that there is a relation between *Eclogue* II. and the *Copa*, and that both poems directly imitate Theocritus VII. and XI., create a strong presumption in favour of Virgilian authorship, the tradition of which is itself, as Mr. Drabkin shows, not lightly to be put aside. The author of the *Copa*, too, like Virgil in the *Eclogues*, contaminates Theocritus with Greek epigrammatists.

The writer minimises the importance of resemblances between Propertius and the *Copa*. To his list, 'given for the sake of completeness' (p. 63), might be added *Copa* 9 and Prop. 3. 13. 35, and *Copa* 4 *ad cubitum raucos excutiens calamos* is to be compared with Prop. 4. 8. 42 *iactabat truncas ad caua buxa manus*, if, as he maintains on p. 96, *ad* governs *calamos*. The study is based on Vollmer's text; it would have been more convenient if an *apparatus criticus* had been added.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*M. Minucii Felicis Octavius:* recensuit Dr. JOSEFUS MARTIN. Pp. 86. (*Florilegium Patristicum*, fasc. 8.) Bonn: Hanstein, 1930. Kartoniert, M. 3.60.

THIS is a scholarly edition, furnished with a Latin introduction, *apparatus criticus*, abundant

linguistic parallels with earlier and later writers, and occasional explanatory notes. There is a good deal to be said for the view adopted by Martin that the *Octavius* is later than Cyprian's *Quod idola di non sint*, and is not in fact among the earliest surviving works of Latin Christianity. Exigencies of space compel me to reserve detailed criticism of this book for another occasion.

*Septimii Tertulliani de Cultu Feminarum libri duo:* recensuit JOSEPHUS MARRA. Pp. xl + 48. Turin: Paravia, 1930. Cloth, 9 lire.

At a time like the present, when the subject of women's dress is being more widely discussed perhaps than ever before in the world's history, this publication is most opportune. Marra won his spurs with his edition of the *De Corona* of Tertullian. For this work he has had unfortunately to depend on earlier collations of the old Agobardine MS., but he has collated three fifteenth-century Florentine MSS. of which one, *Bibl. Magliab.* VI. 9, appears to be important. He has not collated the Luxemburg MS. The edition is a careful piece of work, and can be safely recommended. The editor, however, does not appear to know (p. ix n. 1) that the Paterniacensis is still extant, at Schlettstadt (saec. xi ex.); *caenobii* (p. xv) should be *coenobii*; Rauschen also (p. xvi) has used paragraphs for the *Apology*; on p. xxxii, 292 should be 202; on p. xxxvi, the third edition of Schanz should have been referred to; the text of II. 6, 1 is doubtful Latin; in II. 9, 11 *extimatione* is a frequent mediaeval misspelling of *aestimatione*; biblical echoes are overlooked in II. 7, 3 and 13, 1.

*De Orosio et Sancto Augustino Priscillianistarum Adversarii commentatio historica et philologica.* By J. A. DAVIDS. Pp. 301; one illustration, of human figure with zodiacal signs. The Hague: Govers, 1930.

THIS work is a doctoral thesis of the University of Nymegen written in Latin, and contains a full discussion of the problems with which it deals. The writer is well acquainted both with the original texts and with modern works on the subject, and students of Church history will find the book very useful. The third chapter is of real importance to classical students as it deals at length with astrology in the ancient world, and contains, for example, a discussion of passages in the second and fourth books of Manilius, though the writer appears to be ignorant of the work of Housman and of Garrod on this author. Dutch writers would, in fact, do well to look West sometimes for light. The book is well printed on good paper and well indexed.

*Beati in Apocalipsin libri duodecim:* edited by HENRY A. SANDERS. Pp. xxiv + 657; photographs of four pages of MSS. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. VII.) Cloth, 65 lire (= 14s.).

It would be hard to name a printed work of the Latin Church that will be received with such rapture as this. Though there are twenty-four MSS. of Beatus in existence, there are probably not half as many copies of the sole

printed edition, by Florez (Madrid, 1770). For some reason this was not reprinted in Migne's Latin Patrology, and has thus been practically inaccessible. The work was written in the second half of the eighth century in Northern Spain, and is of twofold interest. In the first place, nearly all the MSS. contain pictures, which have an important place in the history of art. In the second place, the work preserves portions of earlier books, lost in their original form. There seems no doubt that its kernel is the biblical text used by Tyconius in Africa in the second half of the fourth century, with the commentary written by that author. The still earlier commentary by the martyr Victorinus, which Jerome revised, has also been laid under contribution. Portions come from the author's fellow-countryman Isidore of Seville, and so on. The scholarly public has hitherto associated the editor's name especially with the publication of some of our oldest MSS. of the Greek Bible. It is needless to say that the present edition is all that one would expect from an experienced professor of Latin in the University of Michigan. Not only is Florez completely antiquated, but Dr. Sanders has discovered that there were three author's editions of the work, and he is even able to tell us their dates.

Sister Marie Antoinette Martin, *The Use of Indirect Discourse in the Works of St. Ambrose*. Pp. xviii + 165.

Sister Mary Bridget O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543 A.D.* Pp. xvi + 173.

Sister Mary Daniel Madden, *The Pagan Divinities and their Worship as Depicted in the Works of St. Augustine exclusive of the City of God*. Pp. x + 135.

Sister Margaret Gertrude Murphy, *St. Basil and Monasticism*. Pp. xx + 112.

George William Patrick Hoey, *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. Gregory of Nyssa*. Pp. xviii + 127.

THESE five volumes are all Ph.D. dissertations of the Catholic University of America, and were published at Washington, D.C., in 1930, as Volumes 20, 21, 24, 25 and 26 respectively of the now well-known series of *Patristic Studies* of that University.

Sister Marie's work on St. Ambrose's use of indirect discourse is a very careful and thorough piece of work, in particular as regards the *quod, quia, quoniam* construction, and as it is based on good modern editions, it is a valuable contribution to the history of these constructions. She has, however, overlooked the treatment in the *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei* by Sanday, Turner and others (Oxford, 1923), pp. cix-cxi, and has hardly made as much use of her excellent bibliography as she might have made. *Extimare* is rather a mediaeval error for *aestimare* than for *existimare* (p. 43).

Sister Mary's work on titles of address in Christian Latin Epistles is parallel to the interesting study by Sister Lucilla on Greek titles in Volume 18 of the same series. The work seems practically exhaustive, and must have entailed much labour. The careful and lucid

classification of the material deserves commendation, and the work is much fuller than Engelbrecht's pioneer work of 1893.

Sister Mary's thesis on the Pagan Divinities was a work quite worth undertaking. Of course the *City of God*, based as much of it is on Varro, is now a leading authority on ancient Roman worship, but it will be a surprise to many to see how much material on this subject is scattered throughout the other works of the Saint, and it is a great saving of time to have the material thus put together in one volume. There is some carelessness on p. 17, where *Xpōvos* is confused with *Kpōvos*.

Sister Margaret's book on *St. Basil and Monasticism* naturally reminds one of Mr. Lowther Clarke's treatment of the same subject in his Cambridge volume of 1913. She obviously writes from a somewhat different point of view, but it would be a mistake for Anglicans to neglect her work on this account. It has been carried out under the superintendence of Dr. Deferrari, the accomplished translator of St. Basil's letters in the Loeb Library, and her detailed criticisms of Mr. Clarke are all to the good.

Dr. Hoey's volume on the use of the Optative in St. Gregory of Nyssa forms a companion volume to Number 11 in the series, in which that mood as used by St. Chrysostom was studied. Dr. Hoey has the advantage over Dr. Dickinson in the possession of more up-to-date critical texts, by Srawley, Jaeger, Pasquali and Stein. The classification of uses is very detailed, and it is found that Gregory's use of the Optative is substantially in accord with that of the classical period. The writer is justified in questioning (p. 85) four cases of *ei* with the subjunctive in the uncritical Migne edition.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*A Handbook of the Latin Language*. By WALTER RIPMAN. Pp. 804. London: Dent, 1930. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIS book comprises three sections: a dictionary, a vocabulary organised under comprehensive heads, and a grammar, with cross-references between the sections wherever possible.

The dictionary (527 pages), which labours occasionally under excessive compressions and a considerable eccentricity of abbreviation, is of a fair standard of accuracy, but uneven. I have tested it carefully, and the following results will indicate its scope. In the section of words beginning *pro-*, these are omitted—*profluvium*, *profluentia*, *profringo*, *progener*, *prohibitio* (Cic. twice), *prolatio* (Livy, Caesar, Cicero), *prolecto* (Cic., Ovid *Fasti* 4. 433), *prolicio* (Plaut., Ovid, Tacitus), *prolusio* (Cic. twice), *proluviis* (Virgil, Cic., Lucr.), *promissio* (Cic. *Phil.* 8. 3. 10, and elsewhere several times), *promoneo* (Baiter and Klotz's reading for *promovebo* in Cic. *Att.* 4. 12), *prompto* (Plaut.), *promutuos* (Caes. *B.C.* 3. 32), *pronuntiatio* (a bad omission), *prooemium* (Cic., Quint., Juv.), *proporro*, *propudium*, *prorereus* (Ov. *Met.* 3. 634), *prosero*



(=produce), *prospeculor* (Livy twice), *prostitutio*, *provomo*. The following additions should also be made: s.v. *proloquor* add the meaning 'foretell,' s.v. *pronus* add the meaning 'easy,' s.v. *propinquum* add *propinquum* subst., s.v. *protinus* add the form *protinam*, s.v. *provideo* add *proviso* adv. (Tac. *Ann.* 12. 39). As will be seen, some of these omissions are serious even for an elementary student. I note also the following: s.v. *A* the omission of such common abbreviations as *A.U.C.*, and *a.a.a.* in *Iliviri a.a.a.f.f.*; p. 307, the account of *nudus* is incomplete; the conjunctions, e.g. *ut*, *cum*, are rather neglected; there is no mention of *ac*, *atque* in the sense of the English 'than'; common proper names, e.g. *Aventinum*, *Pro-pontis*, *Stator*, *Aonius*, are omitted; many common alternative spellings are not given; the *o*- of *obicio* is wrongly left short by implication, and the second *i* of *tribunicus* is wrongly marked long.

The vocabulary (134 pages) embodies most of the substance of the dictionary grouped according to meaning under such heads as Time, Place, Land, Sea, Sky, Physical Properties, Size and Quantity, etc. This section, though a more liberal introduction of idiomatic phrases would have improved it, should be found helpful by students in translation from English into Latin.

The grammar (140 pages) is comprehensive and orderly, but, like the dictionary, is apt to suffer from the effort at conciseness; not only is the grammar interspersed with syntax and syntactical abnormalities, but even the regular declensions and conjugations are too concentrated in their mode of presentation to commend themselves readily to the beginner. The last section concludes with pages on Word Formation, Word Order and Pronunciation with the help of phonetics. There is also a meagre treatment, under the heading Prosody, of the commoner metrical forms, though there is no treatment of prosody in the stricter sense of the term. These last sections are elementary and unpretentious and do not call for detailed criticism; like the rest of the work, for students who have not more than three years or so to give to Latin, they should prove useful for reference.

R. W. MOORE.

Rossall School.

*La Phonétique latine.* Par A. C. JURET. Pp. 69. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1929. Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres.' Paper, 8 fr.

THE author's aim is to 'initiate students into the study of Latin phonology.' The initiation is a severe if not a lengthy one. The facts stand unadorned in all their scientific probity, with little or no attempt at historical presentment, comparison or argument, an introduction calculated to chill the fervour of the most ardent neophyte. The latter would be wise to begin with Meillet's *Esquisse* and pass thence to some work of a more comparative type, though he will find it useful to possess and have by him this compendium for handy reference. Con-

finied to it alone he would tend to view philology as a kind of linguistic algebra, inhuman and jejune.

JOHN ORR

The University,  
Manchester.

*Latijnsch Woordenboek.* J. VAN WAGENINGEN. 4<sup>de</sup> druk bewerkt door F. MULLER. Pp. xv + 1045. Groningen: Wolters, 1929. Cloth, F. 9.90.

THE fourth edition of this well-known work contains some thirty pages more than the third edition, and includes a useful list of words from Petronius, as well as fresh material from Seneca, Juvenal, Martial, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, and Augustine.

The arrangement is excellent, and quantities are clearly indicated. Great care has been bestowed on the etymologies, which have been revised, and seem generally to follow Walde's second edition. Interesting connexions with the Germanic languages are pointed out—e.g. *canere* is related to the Dutch *haan* ('cock'). Warnings against misleading similarities, such as *θεός* and *deus*, are included. *Edūcatio* is connected with *dūco*, though Dr. Mackail's suggestion that it might come from *Edūca*, an old Italian goddess of infant nutrition, is very attractive.

Meanings are clearly and copiously given, and no pains have been spared to secure clearness. The print is attractively large. If there is a fault to be found, it is that authorities are not sufficiently indicated; yet the book contains a surprising amount of information for its size.

I have noted only one misprint, *κατάχρησις* for *κατάχρησις* under *abusio*.

T. J. HAARHOFF.

Johannesburg.

*Carmina Burana.* Mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten WILHELM MEYERS kritisch herausgegeben von ALFONS HILKA und OTTO SCHUMANN. I and II. Pp. xvi + 112; 96\* + 120; five illustrations in colour. Heidelberg: Winter. Paper, M. 6 and 20.

THIS is the beginning of the edition for which we have so long waited and hoped. We have hitherto depended upon Schmeller's (1847), which has been reprinted unchanged for nearly a century. It was a good enough text for its time, but incomplete and critically very imperfect. Hilka, long known to us as the editor of the admirable Heidelberg *Sammlung mittel-lateinischer Texte*, shares with Manitius and Karl Strecker the pre-eminence in these studies, and no better editor could have been found: further, Hilka and Schumann have had the advantage of being able to use the material left by the incomparable Wilhelm Meyer.

The present instalments contain a very close and detailed description of the precious MS.: it is of artistic as well as literary merit, and some of its illuminations are reproduced in colours—scenes of social life. There are several difficult questions of scribes and correctors, the



order of the poems, and so on, and these are treated with the utmost precision and care: on the literary side Schumann (who is responsible for this introduction) does not go very deep: we have 'ein Ausschnitt aus der weltlichen Klerikerdichtung des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts,' written in Bavaria towards the end of the thirteenth century, the poems themselves collected from different sources.

The 'moral-satirical' poems in this instalment are of considerable importance (e.g. Walter of Châtillon's *Propter Sion non tacebo*) and are edited with unstinting critical and explanatory commentaries: but we look forward eagerly to the tender love-lyrics which are still to come, for it is by these that the *Carmina Burana* have fixed the affections of others besides scholars and historians.

S. GASELEE.

*The Σ Rhapsody of the Iliad.* Annotated by ALEX. PALLIS. Pp. iv + 107. Oxford: University Press (London: Milford), 1930.

IN the preface to his edition (1909) of X Mr. Pallis gave his reasons for believing that in the original text of Homer a short vowel was lengthened at will, provided it bore the ictus. The grounds of this belief, which goes back to a dictum of Fick's that Schulze dealt with in his *Quaestiones Epicae*, cannot be considered here, but this much can be said, that the means which Mr. Pallis employs to restore the pristine text of Σ are so questionable that we can have no confidence in his restoration. Thus, contraction and synzesis are wholly disallowed; passages in other books that tell against proposed changes are freely set aside as 'spurious'; some familiar words and forms, as *δύω*, *πονίομαι*, *Ἀχιλλεύς*, *παθίειν*, and even *ἄν*, are styled 'not Homeric'; *ὁ* is 'the article' in *ποῖον τὸν μῦθον ἔειπες*; and new strange words are adopted or suggested, as *ἀμφιπέλειος* for *ἀμφικύπελλος*, *ἐδοῦσται* for *εἰλυπίναι*, *πυρικοῖτη* ('fire-receptacle') for *πυρὶ κηλέφ. βίην* (for *βοήν*) *ἀγαθός, ἀλφεισίβιαι*, 'bread-nourished' (maidens), for *ἀλφεισίβοιαι*. And so on. The results to the text are of course startling. A line begins *διόδεκᾶ δὲ πάροθε*, and there are endings such as *ἐτέλεισεν, πολλὰ τ' ἄλειον, ὑλγγνής*. The author's manner seems much too bold and peremptory. And he has failed to notice that he has in his haste produced fourth trochees, e.g. *Ἐλᾶμεν ὕας Ἀχαιῶν*, and lines unpleasantly divided into two equal parts. As regards interpolations, he has, in sympathy with Payne Knight, Düntzer and others, assigned about one-third of the whole book to forgers and diaskeuasts, some of them men of little judgment and taste. The excisions, arrived at on grounds of the familiar kinds, can generally be disputed. As an example, it is very hard to follow Mr. Pallis and Faesi-Franke in proscribing lines 579 ff., the spirited picture of two lions attacking a bull, as an unseemly 'tragic addition.'

The notes contain acute observations, the outcome of remarkable ingenuity and long familiarity with the language and verse. Some

of these may even help the eventual clearance of a few of the minor difficulties in Σ.

A. SHEWAN.

*St. Andrews.*

*Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic.*

By CHARLES HENRY BEESON. Pp. viii + 50.

Facsimile of the MS. Cambridge, Mass. :

The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930.

Cloth, \$12.

SUMPTUOUSLY produced; and the facsimile of the manuscript (Harleianus 2736) is clear and good. This early ninth-century MS. of Cicero's *De Oratore* is an autograph of Lupus of Ferrières; it is suggested in the introduction that he may have copied it from a MS. of Einhard, the biographer of Charlemagne. The introduction is only concerned with palaeographic, not with textual problems. Comparison is made with other MSS. written by Lupus, and full account given of his orthography, abbreviations, technical signs, corrections, etc., as also of those of the later hands who emended the MS.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

*Christ Church, Oxford.*

MAX WELLMANN: *Der Physiologus (Philologus, Supplementband XXII, Heft I).* Pp.

116. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuch-

handlung, 1930. RM. 8.50 (bound, 10.50).

THIS monograph, distinguished by real learning, ingenuity, and common-sense, is a real addition to the literature upon a work of sad imbecility, but of great interest to students of the lamentable transition from Greek to medieval science. The results of the search for the antecedents of *Physiologus* must necessarily be probable rather than certain, for it must be pursued among works and authors known only by name or by rare and dubious citation. The result is to show the decline of reason well set in by the first century A.D. The ultimate main source is held to be Bolos-Democritus, but Wellmann draws attention to a strong Syrian element, from which Juba and Tatian and his successors seem also to have derived material. The suggested sources of this are the works of the Neo-Pythagorean Anaxilaos of Thessaly, banished from Italy in 28 B.C., and the *Physika* of Pseudo-Solomon. But both of these are too remote in time to be considered as the immediate source of *Physiologus*, which was written between A.D. 255 and 380, and certainly drew upon a single prototype. The responsibility for this is fixed upon Didymus of Alexandria.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*King's College, London.*

*The Greek Sceptics.* By MARY MILLS PATRICK,

Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Pp. xxi + 339. New

York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

Cloth, \$4.50, or 22s. 6d. (London: Milford).

THIS is not a bad, and not a very good, book. Dr. Mary Mills Patrick has put together in a painstaking way the biographical material to be derived from ancient sources in regard to the men traditionally regarded as exponents of Greek scepticism from Pyrrho to Sextus Empir-

icus, and stated at length the doctrines ascribed to each. But it would be idle to go to her book for any fresh light on the difficult critical questions connected with the history of Greek scepticism. Our two chief authorities, Sextus Empiricus and Diogenes Laertius, belong to some date near A.D. 200; of all the exponents, or supposed exponents, of scepticism before Sextus our knowledge is at second hand. The main question is, How far back did genuine scepticism go? Burnet, in the important article contributed to Hastings, E.R.E., under 'Sceptics,' maintained that whilst scepticism of a kind began with Arcesilaus, neither Pyrrho nor Timon having been a sceptic at all, the first thorough-going sceptic was Agrippa, whose date must have been later than that of Aenesidemus—i.e., after the Christian era. Dr. Mills has apparently no knowledge of this article, although the volume of Hastings which contains it was published in 1920. She alleges in her Preface that there are few sources of information regarding Greek scepticism in the English language. That may be true, but the sources must appear even fewer than they actually are, if, writing in America, you omit to ascertain what has been written on the subject in England. Dr. Mills seems to have read Brochard, although one would not gather he had made much impression upon her: she still represents Pyrrho as a sceptic, although Brochard, with whom Burnet on this point agrees, showed the probability that Pyrrho was an ascetic and quietist, with no theory of intellectual scepticism. Dr. Mills's own judgments in the book are facile and chatty. The volume is swelled with a certain amount of matter which has little bearing on

scepticism; because Pyrrho is said at one time of his life to have been a painter and his native place was Elis, we are given an account of the artistic school of Sicyon on the other side of the Peloponnesus; because Pyrrho went with Alexander the Great to India, we are given a page about Alexander's invasion of Asia Minor and Egypt. The Bibliography at the end is similarly expanded by the inclusion of such works as Edwin Pears's *Destruction of the Greek Empire* and Jean Réville's *Origines de l'Épiscopat*.

E. R. BEVAN.

King's College, London.

*Engineering* (in the series 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome'). By A. P. GEST, C.E. Pp. xvi+220. London: Harrap, 1930. 5s.

A STUDY of Greek and Roman engineering by an engineer, as opposed to a classical scholar, should be very valuable; and where Mr. Gest writes of materials and methods of construction his book is interesting and, so far as it goes, useful. But even this part is extremely slight; he can dismiss a complex and important problem in two and a half lines, thus: 'A dome or cupola over a circular drum was, perhaps, less astonishing, but a dome over a rectangular space was amazing.' Even to a beginner this is too vague to be of any real value. The greater part of the book is taken up with lists of individual engineering works, sometimes drawn from good sources, but very often marred by inaccuracies and encumbered with irrelevant detail and anecdote.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

Pembroke College, Oxford.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1930.

GREEK LITERATURE.—I. Düring, *Die Harmonielehre des Klaudios Ptolemaios* [Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXVI, 1930. Pp. cvi+147] (Gohlke). Unusually thorough and careful edition. Earlier theories taken into account and criticised. Also much of linguistic interest.

LATIN LITERATURE.—A. Klotz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* [Leipzig, 1930. Pp. viii+446] (Helm). Intended for students and school teachers, and is midway between a detailed history and a short summary. As a collection of material does not omit much of importance; the presentation is less successful. Reviewer criticises briefly.—*Lucain, La Guerre Civile. Tome II., Livres VI.*—X. Texte ét. et trad. par A. Bourguery et M. Ponchont [Paris, 1929, 'Les Belles Lettres'] (Samse). A special service of this edition is the detailed registration of the readings of Z. Critical apparatus is uneven and does not always take sufficient notice of modern

criticism. Reviewer discusses a number of passages.—R. Ullmann, *Étude sur le style des discours de Tite Live* [Oslo, 1929, Norske Vidensk. Akad. Pp. 130] (Klotz). Valuable contribution to appreciation of the artist in Livy.

HISTORY.—T. Ulrich, *Pietas (pius) als politischer Begriff im römischen Staate bis zum Tode des Kaisers Commodus* [Breslau, 1930, Marcus] (Volkmann). Concentrates his investigation on the pietas of Augustus, concluding with a sketch of the constantly changing shades of meaning in subsequent reigns. Deserves recognition.—E. F. Klein, *Augustin. Ein Lebens- und Zeitbild* [Berlin, 1930, Deutsche Evangel. Buch- u. Traktat-Gesellsch. Pp. 347] (Kuhl). A lively and fascinating account, dealing more especially with the period before A.'s conversion.—*Peuples et civilisations. Histoire générale publiée sous la direction de L. Halphen et Ph. Sagnac. Tome I. Les premières civilisations* par G. Fougères, G. Contenau, P. Jouguet, R. Grousset, J. Lesquier; *Tome II. La Grèce et l'Orient des guerres médiques à la conquête romaine* par P. Roussel; *Tome III.*

*La conquête romaine* par A. Piganiol [Paris, 1929 (2nd. ed.), 1928, 1927, Alcan. Pp. viii + 448, 554, 520] (Lenschau). Sound and thoroughly up-to-date. Even the specialist will find much that is stimulating.—E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches*, Bd. I.: *Vom römischen zum byzantinischen Staate* (284–476 n. Chr.) [Vienna, 1928, Seidel. Pp. 590, with 10 plates and 4 maps] (Philipp). At once a thoroughly scientific piece of work and a pleasantly readable history.—Kromayer-Veith, *Schlachtenatlas zur antiken Kriegsgeschichte*. 5te Lieferung. Griech. Abteilung. II. *Makedonisch-hellenistische Zeit* (Alexander der Grosse), von W. Judeich [Leipzig, 1929, Wagner and Debes. 120 maps on 34 plates with accompanying text] (Grosse). Careful use of ancient literature and clear maps; but numbers of troops engaged often much exaggerated.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.—J. Böhme, *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos* [Leipzig, 1929, Teubner. Pp. vi + 132] (Bickel). Treatment of *θυμός*, *φρόνες*, etc., is good. But reviewer is less satisfied with the rest of the work.—E. Benz, *Das Todesproblem in der stoischen Philosophie* [Stuttgart, 1929, Kohlhammer. Pp. xi + 130] (Nestle). Fine piece of work. B. has mastered the vast material brilliantly.—F. Altheim, *Griechische Götter im alten Rom* [Giessen, 1930, Töpelmann. Pp. 216] (Marbach). Exceedingly important book, introducing a new era in research on Roman religion. New points of view, new methods, surprising results.

LANGUAGE AND LEXICOGRAPHY.—K. Stegmann v. Pritzwald, *Zur Geschichte der Herrscherbezeichnungen von Homer bis Plato. Ein bedeutungsgeschichtlicher Versuch* [Leipzig, 1930, Hirschfeld. Pp. xi + 179] (Runes). In the main successful. Valuable addition to semasiological literature, and important also from Indo-European point of view as a preliminary study. Reviewer criticises de-

tails.—F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griech. Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder, u.s.w., aus Ägypten*. Bd. II., Lief. 1-3; Bd. III., Lief. 1-2 [Berlin, 1925-1929, Selbstverlag der Erben] (Bilabel). Important achievement in spite of omissions and inconsistencies. Only the last part of vol. 3 remains to complete the work.

PALAEOGRAPHY.—J. Bidez, *La tradition manuscrite et les éditions des discours de l'empereur Julien* [Paris, 1929. Pp. 154] (Richtsteig). Sets forth in this well-ordered volume the results of many years of laborious investigation.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—E. B. Stebbins, *The dolphin in the literature and art of Greece and Rome* [Menasha, Wisconsin, 1929, Banta. Pp. 136] (Lippold). Useful collection of material. S. generally shows sound judgment in interpreting meaning of representations of dolphins.—W. Miller, *Daedalus and Thespis. The contributions of the ancient dramatic poets to our knowledge of the arts and crafts of Greece*. Vol. I., *Architecture and Topography* [New York, 1929. Pp. viii + 329] (Morel). May be useful as work of reference when indices have been supplied. Too much repetition and lingering over unessentials, and too little use of modern specialist literature.

#### OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE following papers were read in the Michaelmas Term, 1930:

October 24: 'Iliad XXIII and XXIV: their place in the poem,' by Professor J. L. Myres.

November 7: 'Trajan's Eastern War,' by Mr. R. P. Longden.

November 14: 'Propertius II, 28; III, 17; IV, 1,' by Professor H. E. Butler.

November 28: 'The life of Aristotle in its bearing on the composition and character of the Politics,' by Professor E. Barker.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\* \* \* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Altheim (F.) *Terra Mater. Untersuchungen zur altitalischen Religionsgeschichte*. Pp. viii + 160. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche u. Vorarbeiten, XXII. Band 2. Heft.) Giessen: Töpelmann, 1931. Paper, M. 9.60.

Balmus (C. I.) *Etude sur le Style de Saint Augustin*. Pp. 327. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 35 fr.

Bibliothek Warburg. *Vorträge*. 1928-1929. Pp. ix + 283; 44 plates. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Paper, RM. 20.

Blatt (F.) *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos*. Mit sprachlichem Kommentar

herausgegeben. Pp. xii + 197. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 12.) Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930. Paper.

Bowra (C. M.) *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Pp. ix + 278. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

Conway (R. S.) *Vergil's Creative Art*. Pp. 24. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. XVII.) London: Milford, 1930. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

d'Hérerville (P.) *A la campagne avec Virgile*. Pp. ii + 107. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 12 fr.

- Eos. Commentarii Societatis Philologiae Polonorum.* Vol. XXXII. Pp. 762. 1929.
- Frank (T.)* Life and Literature in the Roman Republic. Pp. vii+256. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Friedländer (P.)* Platon. II. Die platonischen Schriften. Pp. 690. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1930. Paper, RM. 38 (bound, 40).
- Gildersleeve (B. L.)* Selections from the Brief Mention of B. L. G., edited with a biographical sketch and an index by C. W. E. Miller. Pp. liii+493. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Housman (A. E.)* M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Quintus. Recensuit et enarravit A. E. H. Accedunt addenda libris I II III IV. Pp. xlviii+199. London: The Richards Press, 1930. Cloth and boards, 7s. 6d. net.
- Isaac (H. J.)* Martial. Épigrammes. Tome I (Livres I-VII). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 40 fr.
- Kapnukajias (C. K.)* Catull und Phalaekos. Pp. 14. Athens: Blasudakis, 1930. Paper.
- Kleine-Piening (F.)* Quo tempore Isocratis orationes quae Περὶ Εὐφῆνης et Ἀρεοπαγῆτικὸς inscribuntur composita sint. Pp. 77. Paderborn: Schoeninger, 1930. Paper.
- Liddell and Scott.* A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition. Part 5: θησαυροποιεῖα—κῶψ. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Lindemann (H.)* Die Sondergötter in der Apologetik der Civitas Dei Augustins. Pp. 80. Munich: printed by A. Kuspert, 1930. Paper.
- Lösch (S.)* Epistula Claudiana. Der neuentdeckte Brief des Kaisers Claudius vom Jahre 41 n. Chr. und das Urchristentum. Eine exegetisch-historische Untersuchung. Pp. 48. Rottenburg a. N. (Württ.): Bader'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930. Paper, 3.60 M.
- Mackail (J. W.)* The Aeneid, edited with introduction and commentary. Pp. xc+532. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Mackail (J. W.)* Virgil. Pp. 22. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVII.) London: Milford. Paper, 1s. net.
- Mann (L. M.)* Craftsmen's Measures in Prehistoric Times. Pp. 25; X plates. Glasgow: The Mann Publishing Co. Paper, 3s. 6d. (cloth, 5s.) net.
- Naylor (L. H.)* Chateaubriand and Virgil. Pp. xiv+212. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. XVIII.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930. Paper, \$1.25.
- Owen (A. S.) and Webster (T. B. L.)* Excerpta ex antiquis scriptoribus quae ad forum Romanum spectant. Pp. iv+82. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Perrotta (G.)* Sofocle, Le donne di Trachis. Traduzione, due saggi critici e un'analisi. Pp. xi+197. Bari: Gius. Laterza e Figli, 1931. Paper.
- Reeb (W.)* Tacitus Germania. Mit Beiträgen von A. Dopsch, H. Reis, K. Schumacher unter Mitarbeit von H. Klenk herausgegeben und erläutert von W. R. Pp. v+173; a map and illustrations. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Cloth, RM. 7.60 (unbound, 6).
- Ritter (C.)* Die Kerngedanken der platonischen Philosophie. Pp. x+346. Munich: Reinhardt, 1931. Paper, RM. 12 (bound, 14).
- Rose (H. J.)* Modern Methods in Classical Mythology. Pp. 50. St. Andrews: University Press, 1930. Paper, 2s. 6d.
- Rzach (A.)* Charisteria A. R. zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht. Pp. 186. Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1930. Paper, M. 9.
- Sabbadini (R.)* P. Vergili Maronis Opera. Recensuit R. S. Vol. I.: Bucolica et Georgica. Pp. xi+198. Vol. II.: Aeneis. Pp. iv+470. Romae: Typis Regiae Officinae Polygraphicae, 1930.
- Schenk (D.)* Flavius Vegetius Renatus. Die Quellen der Epitoma Rei Militaris. Pp. viii+88. (Klio, Beiheft XXII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 6.
- Schmidt (M.)* Die Komposition von Vergils Georgica. Pp. 235. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XVI. 2./3.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1930. Paper, 12 M.
- Sihler (E. G.)* From Maumee to Thames and Tiber. The Life-Story of an American Classical Scholar. Pp. ix+269. New York: The New York University Press, 1930. Cloth.
- Souilhé (J.)* Platon, Tome XIII. 2<sup>e</sup> Partie: Dialogues suspects. 3<sup>e</sup> Partie: Dialogues apocryphes. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 30 francs each.
- Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. IX. Ediderunt S. Eitrem et G. Rudberg. Pp. 114. Oslo: Some, 1930. Paper.
- Tate (J.)* The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus rendered into English verse with an introduction and notes. Pp. 68. Oxford: Blackwell, 1930. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- The Cambridge Ancient History.* Vol. VIII. Rome and the Mediterranean, 218-133 B.C. Pp. xxv+842; maps, tables, plans, etc. Volume of plates III. Pp. xiii+198. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 35s. and 12s. 6d. net.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1930. Edited by S. G. Owen. Pp. xi+130. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1930. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Ullman (B. L.)* Third Latin Book. By B. L. U. with the collaboration of N. E. Henry and D. S. White. Pp. xiv+527+105; illustrations. New York: The Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan), 1930. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- von der Mühl (P.)* Der grosse Aias. Pp. 42. Basel: Reinhardt, 1930. Paper.
- Walde (A.)* Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann. 2. Lieferung. Pp. 81-160. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, M. 1.50.
- Wuthnow (H.)* Die semitischen Menschenamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients. Pp. 175. (Studien zur Epigraphik und Papyruskunde, Band I, Schrift 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 15.50.



eben  
map  
eub-  
)  
chen  
lein-  
sical  
Uni-

sten  
hen-  
I. 9.  
pera.  
et  
neis.  
Offi-

Die  
viii  
Die-

rgils  
chte  
der.

and  
las-  
The  
i.  
tie:  
rues  
Col-  
ris:  
mcs

S.  
slo:

cus  
tro-  
ack-

III.  
B.C.  
etc.  
am-  
55s.

30.  
tol:

L.  
and  
tra-  
any  
d.  
42.

ör-  
ron  
60.  
50.  
en-  
yri  
en  
I,  
eer,